THE NATIONAL CHURCHES

# ENGLAND

VOL. II.

J. H. OVERTON.

K. STEVE McCormick

BRECON CATHEDRAL LIBRARY.

*"The general idea of the series is excellent."*—GUARDIAN.
*"The scheme excites our interest."*—SATURDAY REVIEW.

# THE NATIONAL CHURCHES.

## I.—GERMANY.

BY THE REV. S. BARING GOULD, M.A.,
Author of "Mehalah," "Germany Past and Present," &c.
With Maps. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

*"Mr. Baring-Gould's contribution is excellent . . . one of the best accounts in English of the German Reformation that we have ever come across."*—GUARDIAN.

## II.—SPAIN.

BY THE REV. FREDERICK MEYRICK, M.A.,
Prebendary of Lincoln.
With Map. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

*"It is a really valuable work."*—MANCHESTER EXAMINER.

## III.—IRELAND.

BY THE REV. THOMAS OLDEN, M.A.,
Vicar of Ballyclough.
With Maps. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

*"Seldom has the student of Irish history the good fortune to encounter work so learned and so simple, so instructive and so entertaining, as this brilliant epitome of the history of the early Irish Church."*—ATHENÆUM.

## IV.—THE NETHERLANDS.

BY THE REV. P. H. DITCHFIELD, M.A.,
With two Maps. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

*"The books from which the material of the prior part is drawn are so thoroughly inaccessible to English readers that the work has the value which attaches to the monopoly of the subject. But it does not need this to recommend it to any one who takes an interest in Church history."*—THE SCOTSMAN.

## V.—SCOTLAND.

BY THE VERY REV. H. M. LUCKOCK, D.D.,
Dean of Lichfield.
With two Maps. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

*"His pages are packed with facts from which you are at liberty to draw your conclusions, and which he never garbles or distorts with a view to bolstering up his own. He displays a really surprising comprehension of affairs peculiarly Scottish."*—NATIONAL OBSERVER.

## VI.—ITALY.

BY THE REV. A. R. PENNINGTON, M.A.,
Canon of Lincoln.

With Maps. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

*"A most valuable addition to that very instructive and useful series 'The National Churches.'"*—RECORD.

*"The plan of the work is at once comprehensive and compact, and the style and treatment easy and luminous."*—SCOTSMAN.

## VII.—FRANCE.

BY THE REV. R. TRAVERS SMITH, D.D.,
Canon of St. Patrick's, Dublin.

With Maps. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

*"Few could fail to be greatly interested in the work before us . . . The student will learn much from the clear arrangement of the attractive topics which go to make up the book . . . We cordially recommend this History to students of a fascinating and too much neglected subject."*—CHURCH TIMES.

## VIII.—AMERICA.

BY THE RIGHT REV. LEIGHTON COLEMAN,
Bishop of Delaware, U.S.A.

With Map. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

## IX.—ENGLAND.

BY THE REV. JOHN HENRY OVERTON, D.D.,
Rector of Epworth and Canon of Lincoln.

In two Vols. Vol. 1 with Map. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

## X.—ENGLAND.

BY THE REV. JOHN HENRY OVERTON, D.D.,
Rector of Epworth and Canon of Lincoln.

In two Vols. Vol. 2 with Map. Cr. 8vo, cloth boards, **6/-**.

---

LONDON : GARDNER, DARTON & CO.
NEW YORK : JAMES POTT & CO.

203 AIII

# The National Churches.

EDITED BY

P. H. DITCHFIELD, M.A., F.R.HIST.S.

---

THE

# CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

K. STEVENSON

THE

# CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

BY

JOHN HENRY OVERTON, D.D.

RECTOR OF EPWORTH AND CANON OF LINCOLN.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

GARDNER, DARTON & CO.,

3, PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS, E.C.

AND 44, VICTORIA STREET, S.W.

1897.

# CONTENTS OF VOL. II.


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | THE STUART PERIOD—THE CHURCH IN THE REIGN OF KING JAMES I. (1603-1625) | 1 |
| II. | THE STUART PERIOD—THE LAUDIAN MOVEMENT | 33 |
| III. | THE STUART PERIOD—FROM THE ACCESSION OF CHARLES TO THE OPENING OF THE LONG PARLIAMENT (1625-1640) | 55 |
| IV. | THE STUART PERIOD—FROM THE OPENING OF THE LONG PARLIAMENT TO THE RESTORATION OF THE MONARCHY (1640-1660) | 81 |
| V. | THE STUART PERIOD—THE CHURCH IN THE REIGN OF CHARLES II. (1660-1685) | 126 |
| VI. | THE STUART PERIOD—THE CHURCH IN THE REIGN OF JAMES II. (1685-1688) | 158 |
| VII. | THE STUART PERIOD—THE CHURCH IN THE REIGN OF WILLIAM III. AND MARY II. (1689-1702) | 169 |
| VIII. | THE STUART PERIOD—THE CHURCH IN THE REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE (1702-1714) | 195 |
| IX. | THE GEORGIAN ERA—THE CHURCH IN THE REIGNS OF GEORGE I. AND GEORGE II. (1714-1760) | 211 |

CHAPTER PAGE

X. THE GEORGIAN PERIOD—THE CHURCH IN THE REIGN OF GEORGE III. (1760-1820) - - 251

XI. THE GEORGIAN PERIOD—FROM THE ACCESSION OF GEORGE IV. TO THE OXFORD MOVEMENT (1820-1833) - - - - - 302

XII. THE OXFORD MOVEMENT (1833-1845) - - 315

XIII. THE CHURCH IN THE VICTORIAN ERA AFTER THE OXFORD MOVEMENT - - - 348

LIST OF AUTHORITIES - - - - 423

INDEX - - - - - - 440

# HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND

## CHAPTER I.

### THE STUART PERIOD.

*The Church in the Reign of King James I.* (1603-1625).

Hopes of Puritans and Roman Catholics on accession of James I.—Millenary Petition—Hampton Court Conference —Convocation of 1603—Enactment of 141 canons—Authorized Version of the Bible—Richard Bancroft as Primate —Severe measures against Puritans—And against Roman Catholics, especially after the Powder Plot—Last burnings under the *De Hæretico* Act—Conflicting estimates of Bancroft—George Abbot, his successor—Proposed college for controversial divinity—Writers on the Roman controversy —The Sabbatarian controversy—First Book of Sports—The Calvinistic controversy—Calvinism dominant—Reaction against it at close of James's reign.

THE death of the great Queen was the signal for a general scramble for the favour of her successor. It was an open question whether James would throw the weight of his influence into the Puritan, the Roman, or the Anglican scale, and of the three parties the first had the strongest, and the last the weakest, ground for hope. The Puritans could plead

that he had been brought up in a kindred system to their own; he had been filled, almost to repletion, with the doctrines which the Presbyterian ministers had inculcated upon him at portentous length; and apparently their efforts had not been in vain; for he had signed the Solemn League and Covenant; he had on many occasions expressed his preference for Presbyterianism; in the General Assembly at Edinburgh, in 1590, he 'praised God that he was King of such a Church, the sincerest Church in the world,' and then, touching upon that Church of which he must have been aware that in course of time he would probably be 'Supreme Governor,' he said, 'As for our neighbour Kirk in England, their service is an evil-said Mass in English; they want nothing of the Mass but the liftings'; and in 1598 he told his Parliament that 'he minded not to bring Papistical or Anglican bishops.' The Roman Catholics had strong reason to hope that he would at least tolerate them. He was born of Roman Catholic parents on both sides; he had been baptized according to the rites of the Church of Rome; his mother, whom he professed to reverence, had died a martyr to that Church, which he had not hesitated to call his mother Church on occasions. The Anglicans had no reason for encouragement beyond the faint hope that he might desire to leave things as they were, and accordingly many of them were in despair.

Each party approached the new King in the way that their knowledge of his antecedents would naturally prompt them to do. The Anglicans were content to send one representative to him before he quitted Scotland, Dr. Nevile, Dean of Canterbury,

who was commissioned by the archbishops and bishops simply to present to him their congratulations, and to endeavour to ascertain what line he was about to take.[1] But the answer they received must have been unexpectedly encouraging; 'he would uphold the Church of England as it was established by Queen Elizabeth, and was anxious to be informed on ecclesiastical subjects and the present state of the Church.' The Roman Catholics boldly claimed an open toleration. But the Puritans read him a lecture in the shape of a petition. On his progress from Edinburgh to London the so-called Millenary Petition, signed in reality by 753 ministers, was presented to him. It expressed the signatories' objections to the use of the cross, to the questions addressed to infants in the baptismal service, to Confirmation *in toto*, to the square cap and surplice, to the ring in marriage, to the custom

[1] The choice of Dr. Nevile, which was mainly due to Whitgift, was a wise one. He was just the man to make an impression upon James, who was much affected by appearance. Dean Nevile came of that ancient stock which had been so conspicuous in the times of the Plantagenets. He had all the marks of high breeding about him. 'He had never his like,' wrote Hacket ('Life of Archbishop Williams'), 'for a splendid, courteous, and bountiful gentleman.' Fuller terms him 'the magnificent Nevile.' And he was not only an ornamental man, but one who had won his spurs by his personal achievements. Successively Fellow of Pembroke, Master of Magdalene, and Master of Trinity, at Cambridge; Dean of Peterborough and Dean of Canterbury; he had held each position with credit. He was high in the confidence of Whitgift, and, as chaplain to Queen Elizabeth, had been accustomed to royalty. Some years later King James, in his visit to Cambridge, March, 1614-15, said 'he was proud of such a subject'; and there is little doubt that the new King was favourably impressed by the representative of the English Church at their first interview.

of bowing at the name of Jesus, to the reading in church of any but the canonical Scriptures, to pluralities, non-residence, and 'unpreaching ministers.' It asked for a better maintenance of the parochial clergy by a restoration of the greater part of ecclesiastical impropriations, and of a sixth or a seventh of all lay ones, for a redress of Church discipline generally, and, finally, for a conference to be held between the Puritan and the non-Puritan clergy.

On the last point the new King was quite ready to meet their wishes, for he was always glad of an opportunity of airing his theological knowledge and his controversial abilities. But it should be added that about some of the other points of the petition the Anglicans were quite as anxious as the Puritans. The King himself also was alive to their importance, and directed Archbishop Whitgift to instruct his suffragans to inquire into the condition of their respective dioceses, the number of recusants, the state of incumbents, and the value of preferments. He also wished for information about the Book of Common Prayer; and it was probably quite as much on these accounts as in consequence of the Millenary Petition that the famous Hampton Court Conference was appointed to be held.

A conference, indeed, on equal terms it could scarcely be called. In the very proclamation under which it was to be held, the King twice declared his own perfect approbation of 'the doctrines and discipline of the Church as by law established,' and his conviction that it was 'agreeable to the Word of God and to the forms of the primitive Church.' The absurd disproportion in numbers between the repre-

sentatives of the respective parties shows that no fair fight was intended. The Anglicans were represented by nine bishops, seven deans, and three other eminent divines; while the Puritans had only four representatives in all.[1] They were all, on both sides, nominated by the King. The arrangements were made by Archbishop Whitgift, who consulted with his brother Archbishop of York, Dr. Hutton. Dean Barlow was appointed chronicler of the proceedings, and it is to his pen that we are indebted for the only official account of the proceedings.

The first day's meeting was on January 14, 1603-4; but this can hardly be called a part of the conference proper, for the Church party alone was admitted. It was an unfortunate arrangement, because it gave a handle to the enemy to say that it was all settled beforehand; but this does not seem to have been really the case. The object was to give the King information about the Church, in which, considering his acuteness and his deep interest in theological questions, he seems to have been surprisingly deficient, as the questions he asked

[1] On the Anglican side were the Archbishop of Canterbury (Whitgift), the Bishops of London (Bancroft), Durham (Mathew), Winchester (Bilson), Worcester (Babington), S. David's (Rudd), Chichester (Watson), Carlisle (Robinson), Peterborough (Dove), the Dean of S. Paul's (Overall), Chapels Royal (Andrewes), Chester (Barlow), Salisbury (Bridges), Gloucester (Field), Worcester (Montague), and Windsor (Thomson); the Archdeacon of Nottingham (King), and two others. On the Puritan side were John Raynolds, Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and President of Corpus Christi College; Thomas Sparks, Professor of Divinity at Oxford; Lawrence Chadderton, the first Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge; and John Knewstubs, a leading member of S. John's College, Cambridge.

about the most elementary points of the Church system plainly show.

On January 16 the real conference began. The four representatives of the Puritans were admitted, 'clad in Turkey gowns.'[1] Their small numbers and their unecclesiastical appearance must have presented a strange contrast to the twenty divines in the imposing vestments of the Church. Dr. Raynolds, however, was a host in himself, and in learning, piety, and general reputation, was equal to the best. He stated the case in behalf of the Puritans. It was not *his* fault that his words have all the weariness of a twice-told tale. It was his duty, of course, to urge once more the objections which had been alleged over and over again against the Church's doctrine, discipline, and system generally. He performed his task ably and temperately, but it is quite unnecessary to present to the reader a 'crambe repetita'; for if he has waded through the preceding pages, he must be only too familiar with it all. It will suffice to select a few salient points, particularly those which had a bearing upon the future events in the history of the Church. One object of the Puritans was to make the Church more distinctly Calvinistic. Dr. Raynolds pressed the doctrine of final perseverance. He suggested that in Article XVI., after the words 'we may depart from grace,' should be added, 'yet not totally or finally,' and that the discarded Lambeth Articles should be introduced into the text of the Thirty-Nine. At this suggestion we

[1] Their dress caused Bishop Bancroft to stigmatize them in rather unepiscopal, not to say vulgar, language, to the King, as 'Cartwright's schollers, schismatics, breakers of your laws. You may know them by their Turkie grograms.'

are all sorry to learn that the Bishop of London (Bancroft) interrupted, and endeavoured to put a stop to the whole proceedings; but he happily met with a dignified and deserved reproof from the King. Another point which shows how entirely out of sympathy with the Church system the Puritans were, and how the inevitable result of yielding to them must have been to cut off the Church from Catholicism, was a suggestion made with regard to Confirmation. Dr. Raynolds remarked very truly that it was quite impossible for the bishops to examine the candidates throughout their extensive dioceses, and that it was very wrong to confirm without due examination. But his remedy was, not the appointment of more bishops, nor the examination of the children by deputy, but that the administration of Confirmation should not be confined to bishops. Of course, it was immediately answered that this was contrary to the custom of the Church in all ages, and also to Scripture as understood in primitive times; and the matter was laid aside. The King himself, owing to his education in Presbyterian Scotland, was strangely at sea in the matter of Confirmation. He said he had been told it was a part of Baptism, without which Baptism was not valid, and this he pronounced blasphemy. The Archbishop replied, rather inadequately, that it was an ancient custom of the Church; to which the Bishop of London very properly rejoined that 'it was more than this: it was an Apostolical institution,' in proof of which he referred to Heb. vi. 2. It is added that, to satisfy the King—and presumably Dr. Raynolds also—it was agreed that the words 'examination of children' should be added to the word

'Confirmation.' It was objected, again, that the Church Catechism was too short, while Nowell's Catechism was too long. The King made the obvious suggestion that, if so, an addition might be made to the Church Catechism; and, in consequence, we owe it to the Hampton Court Conference that we have the last part of the Catechism relating to the Sacraments. It was also in consequence of the King's stumbling at the word 'absolution,' as 'too like the Pope's pardon,' that the words 'or remission of sins' were added to the rubric before the General Absolution; but it is difficult to see the precise object of the addition. Dr. Raynolds desired to see measures taken for 'a better observance of the Sabbath,' and in this he appears to have had the Anglicans with him; he also suggested a new translation of the Bible, and, though objections were taken to this suggestion, we may fairly set down our Authorized Version as, in part at least, an outcome of the Conference. He objected to lessons from the Apocrypha being read in church, and the King desired him to mark those passages which he thought objectionable. But this would hardly meet the case, for the Puritans scrupled at the authority rather than the subject-matter of the Apocrypha. When Raynolds went on to propose a revival of the prophesyings, the King exploded. He declared that the reformers in Scotland had first triumphed over the bishops, and then over the Crown, and repeated his favourite maxim, 'No bishop, no king.' He declared that they were aiming at a Scots' presbytery, 'which,' he said, 'agrees with monarchy as well as God and the devil.' James used more language

which was very unkingly, and ended by declaring that if the Puritans would not conform, 'he would harry them out of the land.'

The third and last day of the conference (January 18) witnessed a painful scene. The King, encouraged by his exploits at the preceding meeting, came largely to the front, and made a long speech in favour of the oath *ex officio*, which came with singularly bad grace from one who had himself been a Presbyterian within the last six months. It was, however, hailed with rapturous delight by the Anglicans, who had expected very different sentiments from one who had been trained by the Scotch presbytery. The delightful surprise betrayed some of the party into expressions which approached perilously near to blasphemy. 'Undoubtedly,' said the Archbishop, 'your Majesty speaks by the special assistance of God's Spirit'—an expression which can only partially be excused by the great age and failing powers of the speaker. Dr. Raynolds had hitherto been the spokesman for the Puritans, but now Dr. Chadderton came forward and petitioned for a permission to some ministers in Lancashire not to wear the surplice; and the King, in spite of the opposition of the Bishop of London, consented. Then Dr. Knewstubs made a similar petition in behalf of 'some honest ministers in Suffolk,' and did not improve his chance of success by absurdly calling the surplice 'a kind of garment used by the priests of Isis.'[1]

The Puritans refused to accept the decision of the conference for three reasons: The ministers ap-

[1] It was often said that the use of the surplice was suggested by the white garments worn by the Egyptian priests.

pointed to speak for them were not of their own choosing; the points in controversy were not thoroughly debated; and their representatives had been frequently interrupted.

One result of the Hampton Court Conference was the very important work done at the following sessions of Convocation. The conference was an altogether irregular assembly, and its decisions could not be accepted as conclusive by anybody. But the questions at issue were discussed in the Church's proper constitutional assembly, over which, in consequence of the illness and death of Archbishop Whitgift, Dr. Bancroft, Bishop of London, presided. On April 3, 1603, he brought down to the synod the royal license for the enactment of canons, and on May 3 delivered to the Prolocutor of the Lower House 'a Book of Constitutions,' probably collected by himself out of 'The Articles, Injunctions, and Synodical Acts' passed in the reign of Elizabeth, especial reference being had to the canons of 1571 and later. These canons had been confirmed only for the Queen's life; hence the need of a fresh code under the new King. It cannot be said to have been a happy time for ecclesiastical legislation. Puritanism was very strong, and Calvinism still stronger; but the Church was just on the eve of a strong reaction against both, so it was not at all a representative time. However, after long discussion, no less than 141 canons were enacted, and they still remain the basis of the ecclesiastical laws of the English Church. They received the royal assent, but not the sanction of Parliament; hence they are pronounced by the legal authorities of the State not to be binding upon

the laity *proprio vigore*—that is, any farther than as they declare the ancient law of the land. Before they had been discussed by the Convocation of York, the King issued letters patent for their observance in both provinces. But the Northern Province naturally objected to this proceeding, and obtained the royal license to discuss the canons, 'which, having diligently read and examined, they passed with one consent.' These canons virtually, though not explicitly, give synodical authority to the Prayer-Book as it stood after the few alterations agreed to by the bishops at the Hampton Court Conference. They may be described as partly a digest of ancient canons, partly new ones. While all loyal Churchmen will desire to be obedient to them, they can hardly regard them as a satisfactory exposition of the mind of the Church, and would welcome a proper revision of them.

The 141 canons are divided into the following fourteen heads:

1. Of the Church of England (I. to XII. inclusive).
2. Of Divine Service and Administration of the Sacraments (XIII. to XXX.).
3. Of Ministers, their Ordination, Function, and Charge (XXXI. to LXXVI.).
4. Of Schoolmasters (LXXVII. to LXXIX.).
5. Of Things appertaining to Churches (LXXX. to LXXXVIII.).
6. Of Churchwardens, Questmen, and Sidesmen or assistants
7. Of Parish Clerks

(LXXXIX.—XCI.).

8. Of Ecclesiastical Courts belonging to the Archbishop's Jurisdiction
9. Of Ecclesiastical Courts belonging to the Jurisdiction of Bishops and Archdeacons, and the Proceedings in them
10. Of Judges Ecclesiastical and their Surrogates
11. Of Proctors
12. Of Registrars
13. Of Apparitors
14. Of the Authority of Synods

(XCII. to CXXXVIII.). (CXXIX. to CXLI.).[1]

Another result of the Hampton Court Conference was the preparation of a new translation of the Bible; for although the bishops, not without reason, took exception to some of the objections made by the Puritans to the translation then in use, on the ground that they were trivial, yet we have the word of the translators themselves that the conference was the starting-point of their work. It was a project in the arrangement of which King James was quite in his element. He took the matter up warmly, and as early as July, 1604, only six months after the conference, he wrote to the Bishop of London (the archbishopric of Canterbury being now vacant), telling him that he had selected fifty-four divines for the task, though only forty-seven appear to have taken an actual part in it. The selection was an admirable one, including the most eminent scholars of the day,

[1] For further information on the subject, see Joyce's 'England's Sacred Synods,' ch. xiv.; Lathbury's 'History of the Convocations of the Church of England,' pp. 216-231; Trevor's 'Convocations of the Two Provinces,' p. 90, etc.; and of course Wilkins' 'Concilia' and Cardwell's 'Synodalia.'

Puritans as well as Anglicans—Andrewes, Overall, Saravia, Raynolds, Chadderton, Barlow, Sanderson, etc. A not unreasonable objection was raised against the scheme, on the ground that it might give a handle to the Roman Catholics to throw discredit upon the English translation which had been in use for forty years. They might say that, by the tacit confession of the Anglicans themselves, it was erroneous, else why should they desire another translation? To meet this anticipated objection as far as possible, instructions were given that 'the ordinary Bible read in churches, commonly called the Bishops' Bible' (that is, the version of 1558) 'should be followed, and as little altered as the truth of the original would permit.' The translators were divided into six classes, each class undertaking a particular portion of the Holy Book; but every portion was to be examined by the whole body before it was issued. There were to be three separate centres for meeting—Westminster, Cambridge, and Oxford.[1]

[1] The division of labour at the different centres was as follows:

WESTMINSTER.

| | |
|---|---|
| Andrewes, Dean of Westminster<br>Overall, Dean of S. Paul's<br>Saravia<br>Clerke<br>Layfield<br>Leigh<br>Burleigh<br>Kinge<br>Thomson<br>Bedwell | The Pentateuch, and from Joshua to the First Book of Chronicles (exclusive). |
| Barlow, Dean of Chester<br>Hutchinson<br>Spencer<br>Fenton<br>Rabbett<br>Sanderson<br>Dakins | The Epistles of S. Paul and the Canonical Epistles. |

The translators commenced their labours in 1606, and after five years of quiet work the result appeared in the *Authorized Version of 1611*. The final correction of the whole, and the task of writing the arguments of each book, were entrusted to Thomas Bilson, Bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Myles Smith. Dr. Myles Smith also wrote the Dedication and the Preface, the former of which we could have well spared.

The Authorized Version was not so much a new translation as a greatly-improved edition of the Bishops' Bible; it gained a firm hold upon the English nation, and will always remain a noble

CAMBRIDGE.

| | |
|---|---|
| Lively, Richardson, Chadderton, Dillingham, Harrison, Andrews, Spalding, Birge | The Historical Books, from the First Book of Chronicles, and the Hagiographa. |
| Duport, Braithwaite, Radcliffe, Downes, Boyse, Ward | The Apocrypha. |

OXFORD.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Hradinge, Raynolds, Holland, Kilbye, Smith, Brett, Fareclour | The Prophets, greater and lesser. | Ravis, Dean of Christ Church; Abbot, Dean of Winchester; Montague, Dean of Worcester; Thomson, Dean of Windsor; Savile, Perin, Ravens, Harmer | The Four Gospels. Acts of Apostles. Apocalypse. |

monument of a reign which in other respects was far from being a glorious one. Full credit should be given to the King for the part he took in the successful carrying out of this great undertaking. Though he spoiled his reputation by his grotesqueness and pedantry, James was a really learned man himself, and a consistent patron of learning in others. The personal interest he took in the translators' work showed itself, like almost everything he did, in a ludicrous form. With true Scotch carefulness, he endeavoured to provide for the necessary cost of so great a work—at other people's expense. He would give nothing himself, and he would allow nothing to be taken from the public purse, for which he had other uses; he would have it all done at the expense of the Church. He required all the bishops to reserve their next preferments, which were worth £20 a year—in other words, their best livings—in order that *he* (not they) might confer them upon such of the learned translators as he thought fit. He enjoined the bishops to call upon the deans and chapters to subscribe for the necessary expenses—a very unreasonable demand, which was, naturally, not responded to; and he sent letters to the heads of houses at Oxford and Cambridge, urging them to show hospitality to the translators when they visited the Universities to make their necessary investigations.

The Hampton Court Conference and its results have carried us forward some years, and we must now return to the commencement of King James's reign.

On February 22, 1603-4, immediately after the conference, the King issued two proclamations—one

commanding all Jesuits and seminary priests to depart from the kingdom, the other requiring all Puritans to conform to the Church; but the latter requirement does not appear to have been strictly enforced at once.

On February 29 the aged Archbishop Whitgift died; and in October, 1604, his place was filled by the appointment to the archbishopric of Canterbury of Richard Bancroft, Bishop of London, who, in consequence of Whitgift's failing health, had been virtually Primate since the King's accession. Whitgift had been hostile to the Puritans; but Bancroft was still more so, and the effects of the new appointment were soon seen. It was announced that there was to be no more delay in compelling obedience to the King's proclamation concerning conformity. The 36th and 37th of the new canons enacted that no one was to hold a living, preach or catechize, be a reader or lecturer, unless by the license of the Bishop or one of the Universities, and then only on condition of his signing three Articles, in the first of which he acknowledged that the King was supreme in matters spiritual and temporal; in the second, that the Book of Common Prayer contained nothing contrary to the Word of God, and that he would use that book only in public prayer and Sacraments; in the third, that the Thirty-nine Articles were agreeable to the Word of God. The subscriber had 'to set down both his Christian and surname, viz.: "I, N. N., do willingly and *ex animo* subscribe to these three Articles above-mentioned, and to all things that are contained in them."' If these requirements had been made from those who desired to minister in the Church, while those outside it,

ministers or people, were allowed full liberty of conscience, there would have been nothing to be said against them. They are all covered by the undoubted laws of the Church or the State, and it is surely no hardship to require the officer of any society to subscribe 'willingly and *ex animo*' to the laws of that society, or to resign his office; but when resignation meant absolute silence in all religious teaching, then it was a real hardship. There was no difficulty in depriving at once all beneficed clergy who refused to sign; the Act of 1 Elizabeth provided for that. A brief respite was granted to those who, though they shrank from subscribing again to what they had, as clergymen, virtually agreed to before, were yet willing to promise conformity; but the Act was soon afterwards enforced in all its severity.

One would have had more sympathy with these deprived Puritans if they themselves had shown a little more fellow-feeling with sufferers from the same attempt to enforce an iron uniformity in the opposite extreme. But so far from regarding the Roman Catholics, who were far more severely treated than themselves, as fellow-sufferers, they would have had them still more harshly dealt with. Both the King and the Archbishop were certainly inclined at first to deal leniently with the Roman Catholics. At the opening of his first Parliament, James desired it to devise means for rendering unnecessary 'that punishment of recusancy, which,' he thought, 'had been forced to an unjustifiable extreme'; and he spoke of the Roman Church in terms which would have sounded strange indeed to Protestant ears. Whether under any circumstances he could have carried his point is very doubtful; but the discovery

of the Powder Plot in the following year put it quite out of the question. It is true that the leading Roman Catholics had no share in the iniquitous design, which was solely the plot of a very small cabal; but the fact remained, that it was concocted by Roman Catholics, and to promote the cause of Roman Catholicism. Moreover, the head of the Jesuit organization in England at least acquiesced in it. That was quite sufficient for men who had heard from their fathers of the days of 'Bloody Mary.' No efforts of the King or Archbishop could prevent the enactment of terribly severe laws against the whole body. Those who attended their parish churches were 'to receive the Sacrament at least once a year,' otherwise they might be convicted under a penalty of £20 for the first year, £40 for the second, and £60 for the third; while recusants—that is, those who refused to attend church—were to pay £20 a month during their recusancy. The oath of allegiance might be tendered to any Roman Catholic by any Bishop or Justice of the Peace. If he refused to take it, he was liable to be imprisoned until the next assizes; and if he still continued to refuse, he was subjected to the penalties of Præmunire. The very act of reconciling anyone to the see of Rome, or of being reconciled to it, was declared treason. Rewards were offered for the discovery of 'recusants who harboured Popish priests.' All Roman Catholics were forced to reside on their own property; and unless they were exercising any trade in London, they were not allowed to come within ten miles of the Metropolis. They were disabled from being barristers, or attorneys, or physicians, or apothecaries, or officers of Court, or from holding

any commission in the army or the navy; and, what was cruellest of all, inasmuch as it touched the innermost circle of home life, they might not have their children or relations christened, or even buried, except according to the rites of the Church of England. They were forbidden to send their children abroad for education, though no Roman Catholic could be licensed to teach in England. Their children could not inherit any property until they had taken the oath of allegiance, which, as we have seen, was so framed that no conscientious Roman Catholic could take it. Towards the close of his life, James made a fresh effort to show a little more leniency towards the Roman Catholics;[1] but as this leniency was supposed to have arisen from his anxiety for the hated Spanish marriage which he was endeavouring to negotiate for his son Charles, it was not at all favourably regarded by his subjects.

There was also persecution at the other end of the scale. For the last time the detestable statute *De Hæretico Comburendo*, was brought into force, first against an unfortunate man called Bartholomew Legate, who, having been convicted of Arianism, was delivered over by the Bishop of London (Dr. Abbot) to the secular arm, and burnt at Smithfield, March 18, 1612; and then against one Brightman, who, having been convicted, it is said, of ten heresies, was burnt at Lichfield. Then the King discovered his mistake, and it was determined henceforth to burn no more heretics, but 'to suffer

[1] He gave directions to the judges of assize to release all recusants who were confined on account of their religion, and thereby drew upon himself a severe letter from the Archbishop against toleration.

them to waste out their lives in prison,' which was a step, though only a small step, in the direction of toleration.

The Church has no reason to be grateful for these severities which were nominally exercised in her behalf, but really to her detriment. The forcing of Puritans and Roman Catholics into outward conformity could, in the nature of things, only do her harm. Was it likely that people driven to church like sheep into a pen would be edified by her services or be converted to her system? Was this the way to appeal to the moral consciousness of Englishmen, however it might appeal to their fears?

The laws against the Nonconformists were rigorously enforced during the primacy of Bancroft, which lasted from 1604 to 1610. As is natural, the most conflicting estimates have been taken of his character and work. Dr. Neal, the historian of the Puritans, can, of course, find nothing good in him. He was 'a divine of a rough temper, a perfect creature of the prerogative, and a declared enemy of the religious and civil liberties of his country';[1] 'of no extraordinary character for piety, learning, hospitality, or any other episcopal quality'; 'covetous, passionate, ill-natured, and a cruel persecutor of good men.'[2] Lord Clarendon, on the other hand, writes on 'the never enough lamented death of Dr. Bancroft': 'This Metropolitan, who understood the Church excellently, and had almost rescued it out of the hands of the Calvinian party, and very much subdued the unruly spirit of the Nonconformists by and after the conference at Hampton Court, countenanced men of the greatest parts and learning, and

[1] 'History of the Puritans,' i. 416. [2] *Ibid.*, i. 450.

disposed the clergy to a more solid course of study than they had been accustomed to, and, if he had lived, would quickly have extinguished all that fire in England which had been kindled at Geneva; or, if he had been succeeded by Bishop Andrewes, or Bishop Overall, or any man who understood and loved the Church, that infection would easily have been kept out, which could not afterwards be easily expelled.'

There is an element of truth in both these estimates, contradictory as they may sound. Bancroft *did* use harsh measures in forcing the Puritans, if he could, into conformity; he *was* of a hasty temper (to use a mild term); but he also *did* so far 'understand the Church' as to perceive that her system was quite irreconcilable with Puritanism. Upon Bancroft's death almost all men's eyes were turned to Bishop Andrewes; he was in great favour with the King, who appreciated his learning, and still more, perhaps, his racy humour. A number of bishops came up to London to bear testimony to his merits, and returned with a full conviction that he would be the new Archbishop. Then, to the surprise of everyone, and of none more than the selected man himself, Dr. George Abbot (1562-1633), Bishop of London, was chosen to be Bancroft's successor.

In one sense the appointment was an obvious one. It was not a sudden leap into greatness. For many years Abbot's name had been prominently before the public. He had been a marked man at Oxford, where at the early age of thirty-five he had been elected Master of University College, and where, as Vice-Chancellor, he had taken a leading part against the school of which Laud was the ruling spirit. In

doing so, he was on the popular side; for, in spite of the persistent efforts to stamp it out, Puritanism was the dominant form of religion, especially at Oxford and Cambridge.[1] He also took a responsible part in the new translation of the Bible, and was so leading a member of the famous Convocation of 1606 that King James singled him out as his correspondent on the subject, saying, 'I cannot abstain to give you my judgment of your proceedings in Convocation, as you call it.' In 1608 he found a most powerful friend at Court in the Earl of Dunbar, to whom he became chaplain; and he won the lasting gratitude both of the Earl and the King by smoothing the way for the introduction of episcopacy into Scotland by 'his moderate counsels.' These 'moderate counsels' were not very satisfactory from a Churchman's point of view, for they amounted to this, that there was really not much difference between Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism, and that therefore the Scotch had better indulge the King's hobby for the sake of peace and quietness. But they were effectual for the immediate purpose; and the result greatly delighted both the patrons of Abbot, and no doubt led to his rapid rise. He also rendered valuable service by justifying successfully the King's conduct in regard to the mysterious Gowry plot. The pamphlet he wrote on the occasion would not be the less pleasing to the King because it was full of the grossest flattery.[2] He was clearly on the road to preferment.

[1] At Cambridge it had always been; at Oxford it had not been; but it became more and more so under the patronage of the Chancellor of the University, Lord Leicester, and his successors.

[2] He declared James's life was 'so immaculate and unspotted from the world that even malice itself could never find true

In May, 1609, he was appointed Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield; in the next February he was translated to London; and in the following February (1610-11) was made Archbishop of Canterbury, 'as being an able man, and recommended by the late Earl of Dunbar, whose memory is dear to his Majesty.' Hence it was said that, 'by a strong north wind coming out of Scotland, Abbot was blown over the Thames to Lambeth.'[1] But if the north wind had never blown he might have been wafted across by other breezes. He was a learned man, and James loved learning; he was a Calvinist, as James was at that time; he was a strong upholder of the royal prerogative, which was a *sine quâ non;* and he had rendered the King signal services. But the announcement of his promotion was received with dismay. Though he was a Puritan, the Puritans were not over well-pleased with his doings in Scotland; and the Anglicans anticipated disaster to the Church. He had never had any cure of souls; in the quaint language of Fuller, he was 'mounted to command in the Church before he ever learned policy therein, and made a shepherd of shepherds before he was a shepherd of sheep.'[2] From his youth upwards he had been 'stiffly principled' in Puritan doctrines; he

---

blemish in it.' He averred that 'all must acknowledge him [James] to be zealous as David, learned and wise, the Solomon of our age; religious as Josias; careful of spreading Christ's faith as Constantine the Great; just as Moses; undefiled in all his ways as Jehosaphat or Hezekiah; full of clemency as another Theodosius.' See Abbot's Preface to Sir William Hunt's 'Execution, Arraignment, and Conviction of George Sprott,' published in the 'Harleian Miscellany,' ix. 560, etc.

[1] Letter of Mr. Secretary Calvert.

[2] Fuller's 'Church History,' x. 87.

was not likely to press conformity, for, except as a lover of order, his sympathies were decidedly with the Nonconformists.

But if, as a Puritan, he was not inclined to pursue Bancroft's policy against the Puritans, he more than made up for it by his readiness to stamp out Romanism. At Oxford he had caused a number of 'religious pictures' to be burnt as being incentives to idolatry. When called in to arbitrate between Bancroft, then Bishop of London, and the London citizens in a dispute about the erection of a crucifix in Cheapside, he not only condemned the crucifix, but showed an equal objection to a simple cross. 'If,' he said, 'a monument be required, let an obelisk be set up.' He had bitterly opposed Laud at Oxford, and during his short incumbency of the see of London he had shown his determination to repress with a strong hand any manifestations of sympathy with Romanism, and he regarded all Arminian sentiments as indications of such sympathy. Recusants could expect to find little mercy from such a Metropolitan, and they found little. He more than maintained the authority of the High Commission Court, and was not only ready to hand over the heretics, Legate and Brightman, to the secular arm when they were condemned, but took measures to secure their condemnation, urging that judges should be selected who would 'make no doubt that the law is clear to burn them.' He even approved of the use of torture, as his conduct in the case of Edward Peacham, who was charged with libelling the King, shows. If Bancroft was a bigot on the one side, assuredly Abbot was a bigot on the other. Both were conscientious men; but a narrow conscientious man is the most

dangerous of all men at the head of affairs. The Church had hardly fair play to show her true principles under either Bancroft or Abbot.

It is no part of Church history to dwell on the unfortunate accident by which Archbishop Abbot shot a keeper dead in Bramshill Park in 1621, except in so far as it affected the Church by greatly impairing the Primate's influence. Whether such homicide rendered his acts uncanonical need not here be discussed. The misfortune happened just at the time when four bishops-designate were waiting to be consecrated—John Williams to Lincoln, John Davenant to Salisbury, Valentine Cary to Exeter, and William Laud to St. David's. Two at least of the four had no reason to love the Archbishop, but we may charitably hope that it was not personal feeling, but a real doubt upon the point of his disability, which led them to refuse consecration at the Archbishop's hands.

The tastes of King James naturally led him to encourage religious controversy. He encouraged a windy project for establishing a college at Chelsea for the promotion of controversial divinity, Matthew Sutcliffe, Dean of Chester, having left a sum of £4,000, and £300 a year for its endowment. The buildings were actually erected, and the King made the wise choice of Richard Field and Thomas Morton, among others, to be in the first batch of seventeen Fellows; they were to devote themselves entirely to answering the arguments of the Roman Catholics on the one side, and of the Puritans on the other. The scheme came to nothing, but there was still abundance of religious controversy.

First, the *Roman controversy*, so splendidly managed

by Jewell on the Anglican side in the preceding reign, still went on, the King himself entering into the lists. A very formidable antagonist had appeared on the Roman side in the person of the Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmine. The incident of the Gunpowder Plot led to the imposition of a fresh oath of allegiance, which many of the Romanists in England were willing to take until it was condemned by two Papal briefs. James, nothing loath, rushed into the fray, publishing, in 1605, 'A Discourse of the Manner of the Discovery of the Powder Treason,' and in 1606 'An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance,' both anonymously. The latter was answered by Bellarmine, under the name of his chaplain, Matthæus Tortus. The King, who was very well inclined to appear in the list of royal authors, reissued his 'Apologie,' with his name attached to it, and also added 'A Premonition to all most Mighty Monarchies, Kings, Free Princes, and States of Christendom,' warning them against the Papacy. But, with all due deference to James, it must be owned that the controversy brought out a greater author than the royal one. Bishop Andrewes' 'Tortura Torti' was written in answer to Bellarmine (Tortus), and when Bellarmine replied, Andrewes rejoined in a 'Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini,' and in a short tract entitled 'Determinatio Theologica de Jurejurando Exequendo.' It was in this reign that the treatises of that naturalized Englishman, Isaac Casaubon, against the Roman claims, entitled 'Is. Casauboni ad Epistolam Cardinalis Perronii Responsio' (1611), and 'De Rebus ecclesiasticis Exercitationes XVI. ad Baronii Annales' (1614), were both written and published in England at the request

of King James. Also Dean Field's famous treatise, 'Of the Church,' which will be touched upon in connection with the Laudian movement, and Laud's own contribution to the Roman controversy.

The *Sabbath controversy* reached its acute stage in the reign of King James. Sunday amusements had long been a vexed question, and Queen Elizabeth, in her strong dislike of Puritanism, seems to have encouraged them. We are told that at the famous revels at Kenilworth, in 1575, 'the lords and ladies danced in the evening' (of the Sunday) 'with lively agility;'[1] which is all the more significant because the Earl of Leicester, the host, was the great patron of the Puritans. Many other instances are given.[2] But towards the close of the sixteenth century Puritanism became a stronger power, and consequently Sunday recreations were more rare. The Sabbath question was, as we have seen, started at the Hampton Court Conference by Dr. Raynolds, who prayed 'that some effectual remedy might be provided against profaning the Lord's Day,' and his prayer, according to Barlow, 'was universally agreed to.' This may seem inconsistent with the attitude soon afterwards taken by the Church party in regard to the question; but it is not. Both parties might well agree on the expediency of preventing the profanation of the Lord's Day. The divergence would arise upon the next question, 'In what consisted the profanation of the Lord's Day?' The Puritans regarded the day as equivalent to the Jewish Sabbath, and therefore as a fast; the Anglicans regarded it as a festival, differing only in degree, not

[1] Strype's 'Annals,' v. 202.

[2] See Strype, iii. 585; v. 211, 495, etc.

in kind, from other holy days of the Church. Hence, what would be profanation in the eyes of the one would not be so in the eyes of the other. An able defence of the Puritan view, entitled 'Sabbathum Veteris et Novi Testamenti,' by Dr. Bound, a beneficed clergyman in the diocese of Norwich, after having been published in 1595 and then suppressed, was republished by him in 1606, and dedicated to the Bishop of the diocese, Dr. Jegon. The great difficulty which the Sabbatarians had to deal with was the change of the day, but one of them, Theophilus Brabourne, boldly grasped his nettle, and contended for the observance of the Saturday Sabbath. Both Bound and Brabourne were ably answered by Dr. Francis White, Bishop of Ely. The Bishop had, of course, no difficulty in showing that Brabourne's theory was opposed to that of the Church of England, 'to that of the early reformers, to the old councils, which had expressly condemned it, and to the consentient testimony of the Catholic Church'; he contended also that, when Divine service was ended, it was a proper time for sports and recreations, such as music, dancing, playing at games, especially those which were conducive to bodily strength. For this contention he afterwards received at least royal authority. In a progress through Lancashire, on his return from Scotland in 1617, King James observed that the rigour of the Puritan clergy was depriving the working classes of their weekly holiday, and he thought this all the more mischievous because Lancashire abounded in Roman Catholics, and this rigour placed his Protestant subjects at a disadvantage with their Roman Catholic neighbours. Whether the three prelates

who accompanied him, Andrewes, Laud, and Hall, took the same view, is not quite clear. But presumably they did, for the King immediately afterwards published 'A Declaration,'[1] which was afterwards embodied in what was called 'The Book of Sports,' stating that it was 'His Majesty's pleasure that after the end of Divine service they should not be letted, disturbed or discouraged from any lawful recreations such as dancing, either of men or women, archery for men, leaping, vaulting, or any such harmless recreations; or having of May-games, Whitson ales, or morrice-dances, or setting up of Maypoles, or other sports therewith used, so as the same may be had in due and convenient time, without impediment or let of Divine service; and that women should have leave to carry rushes to the church for the decoring of it, according to their old customs; withal prohibiting all unlawful games to be used on Sundays only; as bear-baiting, bull-baiting, interludes, and at all times (in the meaner sort of people prohibited) bowling.' But no one was to have the benefit of this 'Declaration' who had not been present at the whole of Divine service at his parish church, a proviso which Mr. Gardiner quaintly describes as 'bribing men to worship God by the alluring prospect of a dance in the after-

[1] The 'Declaration' was apparently intended in the first instance only for Lancashire, and was based on the recommendations of the Bishop of the diocese (Chester), the famous Thomas Morton; but I do not think it is correct to say, as has been sometimes said, that Bishop Morton was the originator, or even the instigator, of the 'Book of Sports.' The word 'book' was then used for small documents as well as for regular volumes. Thus we hear of 'The Book of Articles,' meaning simply the Thirty-Nine.

noon.'[1] The King afterwards proposed that the 'Declaration' should be read in every church throughout the kingdom; but this purpose was never carried out. Archbishop Abbot flatly prohibited the 'Declaration' from being read in the parish church at Croydon, his own parish church, and many of the clergy who were not puritanically inclined were against it. So the matter dropped for the time, to be revived fifteen years later, when Peter Heylin published his powerful work, 'The History of the Sabbath,' in which he distinctly maintained that 'the Lord's Day was not instituted by Christ, nor commanded by the Apostles; that it was ordained by no other authority than that of the Church, and by the Church was voluntarily consecrated to religious uses.' Later in the century the matter was treated by Hammond, Bramhall, and others, who considerably modified the views expressed by the Anglicans during the period before us.

The *Calvinistic controversy* assumed a new phase during this period, owing to the excitement raised on the Continent by the teaching of Arminius. It has been said that 'Arminianism was unknown in the Church of England until the reign of James I.' This, of course, is true, not to say a truism, so far as the name is concerned, seeing that Arminius was born in 1560, published his first work in 1598, and his famous 'Declaratio' in 1608. It is also true that, in the reaction against Rome which marked the sixteenth century, English Churchmen threw themselves into that system which was most opposed to Rome, and became Calvinists, or, rather, Augus-

[1] S. Rawson Gardiner's 'History of England from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War,' iii. 251.

tinians.[1] This will apply, more or less, to Hooker, Whitgift, Overall—in fact, to the most famous anti-Puritan divines. King James himself was a decided Calvinist, and as late as 1618 sent four divines to the Synod of Dort, to represent the Church of England on the Calvinian side, an irregular and unnecessary, not to say impertinent, proceeding, for what had the Church of England to do with the internal proceedings of the Dutch Church? The divines were George Carleton, Bishop of Llandaff; Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter (who, however, had to return home, owing to ill-health, before the end of the session); John Davenant, Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury; and Dr. Ward, Master of Sidney Sussex College. They were enjoined to take a moderate line, and strive to allay the heats of controversy. Two years earlier (January 18, 1616) the King had shown good sense (which he had in a high degree, if he would but have done himself justice) in discouraging dogmatism on such mysterious subjects, especially among raw youths, who were, of course, only too ready to settle the difficulty off-hand. At the instance of Laud, he sent instructions to the Universities which are among the wisest acts of his reign. It appears to have been the very foolish custom, both at Oxford and Cambridge, to put into the hands of young students of theology some epitome, generally Calvin's 'Institutes,' from which they drew their opinions on very

[1] In April, 1567, the Earl of Sussex told Queen Elizabeth 'he saw that Calvinism was being preached and being taught nearly everywhere.' See Calendar of Letters, etc., in Archives of Simancas, i. 637.

insufficient grounds. The King's instructions were that they were rather to bestow their time 'on Fathers, Councils, Schoolmen, Histories, etc., and not to insist too long on Compendiums and Abbreviations.'[1]

In August, 1622, again probably at the instance of Laud, he sent letters to the two archbishops, to be communicated by them to their suffragans, in which, among other things, he enjoined that 'no preacher of what title soever, under the degree of bishop, or a dean at the least, should presume to preach in a popular auditory on the deep points of predestination, election, and reprobation.'

Gradually Calvinism became identified with Puritanism, and Arminianism with Anglicanism. There was a strong reaction in the later part of King James's reign against the Calvinism which had long been dominant, and the King was carried along with it.[2] This, however, was only part of a larger movement, which was so important that it requires to be treated in a separate chapter.

[1] See Wordsworth's 'Ecclesiastical Biography,' v. 343, note; and 479, note.

[2] The case of Dr. Montague, which was left in abeyance at the close of King James's reign, was partly, though not entirely, connected with the Calvinistic controversy.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE STUART PERIOD.

*The Laudian Movement.*

Original intention of English Reformation—Many had drifted away from it—Laud tried to restore it—Laudians before Laud—Revival of historical and patristic studies—Field's 'Of the Church'—John Overall—His 'Convocation Book' —Bilson's 'Perpetual Government of Christ, His Church' —John Buckeridge—Lancelot Andrewes—His learning, saintliness, and love of ritual—Thomas Morton—His unique position—George Herbert, John Donne, and Nicholas Ferrar—Isaac Casaubon and other foreigners—William Laud—His education and life at Oxford—As Dean of Gloucester—As Bishop of St. David's—His conference with Fisher, the Jesuit—His connection with Buckingham —Statement of his Church views.

THE 'Laudian Movement' certainly did not *originate* with William Laud, but it is rightly called by his name; for before Laud's influence became predominant, the Church was fast drifting into a position entirely inconsistent with its reiterated claims from the first moment of its throwing off the Papal yoke; and the man who above all others helped to turn the tide was William Laud. Over and over again it had been affirmed, and with perfect sincerity, that though the Church of England broke with Rome, it never meant to break with Catholicism. It retained in its formularies such expressions as 'the Holy Catholick Church,' 'the Catholick Church,'

'the one Catholick and Apostolick Church,' 'the Catholick Faith,' 'Christ's Church militant here in earth,' 'Thy Church and Household,' but never introduced a single expression which implied its intention to separate itself from the unity of Christendom. Neither the National Church itself nor any part of it was ever called by the name of any individual; there is a marked absence in every one of its formularies, rubrics, etc., of the name of any English Divine; in fact, a person who derived his information solely from internal sources would be utterly in the dark as to the name of a single person who took any part in the English Reformation. All this was done with a purpose. The Reformation was merely intended to be a throwing off of accretions, not the origination of any new society. If any contemporary had talked, as people talk nowadays, of a new Parliamentary Church founded by Henry VIII., he would certainly either have been burnt or hanged for his pains. There *was* no new Church; it was the old one still.[1]

This was the theory; but as a matter of fact it was becoming far otherwise. A large and increasing party within the Church itself, who were called sometimes Puritans, sometimes Precisians, sometimes Calvinists, aimed, not at obtaining toleration for their own views and forms of worship, nor yet at destroying the Church, but at metamorphosing it in

[1] 'There was no moment when the State, as many people fancy, took the Church property from one religious body and gave it to another. The general taking from one religious body and giving to another, which many people fancy took place under Henry VIII. or Elizabeth, simply never happened at all.' —E. A. Freeman, 'Disestablishment and Disendowment.'

such a way that it must have entirely broken with the past and become a new community altogether. In this party were many of the ablest, most learned, and most pious people in the land, and they had the immense advantage of knowing exactly what they wanted; they had a definite policy, which many of their adversaries had not.[1] There was, however, always a minority which clung to the old idea of the English Reformation. Laud's designs were no novelties; he was, in fact, himself the creation rather than the creator of the movement which we are now to consider; but he was the man who first made that movement deeply and widely felt. There were, however, Laudians before Laud, and it will be desirable, first of all, to draw the reader's attention to some of them.

It is impossible to assign any particular date to the movement, because the theory on which it rested had been held from the beginning. But it may be noted that the remarkable revival of what may be termed the historical method in general, and of patristic studies in particular, during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, gave an immense impetus to it. The *via media* was seen to be not only a perfectly intelligible and logical position (no mere compromise between two extremes) not only a position in which the Church could retain what was primitive and reject what was novel, in which she could throw off mediævalism and still continue

[1] Writing of the times of Queen Elizabeth, Mr. J. A. Froude affirms that 'every earnest man who was not a Puritan was a [Roman] Catholic' ('History of England,' xi. 471). This is a disagreeable way of putting it, but I fear there is a considerable amount of truth in the assertion, though it is too sweeping.

to worship God in the beauty of holiness, but also one that had the sanction of prescription. Those who walked consistently on this road found that they had history and the Fathers on their side, and that these were invaluable allies. Beginning with Hooker, and going on with Field and Bilson and Andrewes and Overall and Buckeridge and Casaubon, all of whom were Laud's seniors and wrote quite independently of him, the movement went on, gathering strength as it went, and converting the Church of England into a society which was worth living in—ay, and dying for.

Of Richard Hooker enough has been said. We may therefore turn to his intimate friend, though his junior by eight years, *Richard Field* (1561-1616), Laud's predecessor in the deanery of Gloucester. Field had been well known as a learned divine in the days of Queen Elizabeth, who had a high opinion of him; but it was not until 1606 that he made his great reputation by his famous treatise 'Of the Church.' It has been said that what Hooker's 'Ecclesiastical Polity' was to the Puritans, that Field's 'Book of the Church' was to the Roman Catholics. But there is this difference between the two writers: Hooker was breaking up a virgin soil —at any rate, before he wrote there was no book on the subject which has any pretensions to be called classical; Field was going over the ground which Jewell, a true classic, had traversed before him; but his book was a most necessary supplement to those of Jewell. As against Rome, Jewell was most satisfactory and exhaustive; but he was *de*structive rather than *con*structive. This is not imputed to him as a fault; the nature of his under-

taking led him to be so. There was, however, something of the Puritan about Jewell, though it became less marked as the years rolled on. There was nothing of the kind about Field; hence he is more clear and definite on the position of the Church of England as against Rome on the one hand, and Geneva on the other. It becomes in his hands, not a mere negation, but a positive institution, capable of awakening enthusiasm. He gives the keynote in his 'Epistle Dedicatory to the Archbishop of Canterbury' (Bancroft), in which he declares his object is 'to search out which is the Household of Faith, the Spouse of Christ, the pillar and ground of the truth.' He carries out his search most ably, and not the less successfully because his tone is temperate and charitable. His scrupulous fairness brings out all the more strongly the definiteness of his convictions. There is an epigrammatic force in such a description of the situation as this: 'At the Reformation we separated from a part which claimed to be the whole, that we might hold with the Church Catholic against the pretensions of the Church of Rome.' There are possibly some points in Dean Field's work which Churchmen would wish to see more plainly stated; but it is a most valuable book, especially from the point of view of those who desired to see a work of building up as well as a work of pulling down, however necessary the latter work might be.

Another Churchman who helped largely in the constructive work of the Church of England was *John Overall* (1560-1619), Dean of S. Paul's, and afterwards successively Bishop of Ely and of Norwich. How strong a Churchman of the Laudian type

Overall was is shown by the mere fact that he, above all men, moulded the Churchmanship of John Cosin, who was Overall's secretary and librarian in his early years, and who always spoke of him as 'his lord and master.' Overall also shares with Bishop Andrewes the credit of establishing in the true faith of the Church that most distinguished foreigner, Isaac Casaubon, who found a spiritual home, which he had in vain sought elsewhere, in the Church of his adopted country.

The readiest way of learning what Overall's views were is to turn to the Church Catechism, the last part of which, 'On the Sacraments,' was his composition. But the book by which his name is best known is that which is popularly called 'Overall's Convocation Book.' Its history is a curious one. It was a direct result of the Gunpowder Plot. The accounts are rather confused, but it appears to have been the express desire of the King that, in face of the late startling event, the subject of the relationship between a Sovereign and his subjects should be discussed in Convocation. He sent down his license to the Convocation of Canterbury to enact canons on the subject. Dr. Overall, then Dean of S. Paul's, was elected Prolocutor (January 22, 1605-6), in the room of Dr. Ravis, who had been promoted to the bishopric of Rochester. On January 24 the new Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Bancroft) produced a book, commonly called 'Overall's Convocation Book,' or the 'Convocation Book of 1606,' but the full title of which now is 'Bishop Overall's [the word 'Bishop' occurs, because it was not published until long after Overall's death] Convocation Book of MDCVI. concerning the Government of God's

Catholick Church and the Kingdoms of the Whole World,' and desired both houses to take copies and consult about it. The writer shows in an exhaustive way, and by innumerable instances drawn from history, from the creation of the world onwards, the Divine right of kings *and* bishops, in opposition to the Divine right of any bishop or bishops to be above kings; in other words, in opposition to the claims of Rome on the one side, and to the Divine right of the Presbyterian discipline on the other. It was divided into three books, and no less than forty-six canons were enacted on the basis of the work, thirty-six corresponding with the thirty-six chapters of the first book, and ten with the last ten chapters of Book II. The whole work was sanctioned by the Lower House, for at the close of it is appended a note:

'Hæc omnia superscripta ter lecta sunt in domo inferiori convocationis in frequenti synodo cleri, et unanimi consensu comprobata.

'Ita testor, JOHANNES OVERALL, *prolocutor*.'

The first book, with the Constitutions attached, was also sanctioned by the Upper House of Canterbury and by both Houses of York, but it did not receive the royal assent. King James thought that Canon XXVII. favoured too much the idea that a King *de facto*, who was not also King *de jure*, might claim the allegiance of the subject. So the book was not printed, and it dropped out of notice for eighty years. But the manuscript in time passed into the hands of Archbishop Sancroft, being deposited in the Lambeth Library; and he, in 1690, having collated it with another manuscript in Overall's own handwriting,

which was preserved in the Cosin Library at Durham, published it, in order, oddly enough, to justify the conduct of the Nonjurors, one of whom, however, Dr. Sherlock, professed to be converted by it to the National Church under William and Mary.

*Thomas Bilson* (1546-1616), Bishop of Winchester, was another famous defender of the Church on the historical side. His 'Perpetual Government of Christ, His Church,' published in 1593, is a striking illustration of what has been said above about the revival of historical and patristic studies, which proved a great strength to the Church. Anthony à Wood says Bilson was 'as revered and learned a prelate as England ever produced, a profound scholar exactly read in ecclesiastical authors, and, with Richard Field, a principal maintainer of the Church of England.' Bishop Bilson's learning and scholarship are indisputable, and he wrote in a singularly dignified and weighty style.

*John Buckeridge* (1562-1631), successively Bishop of Rochester and Ely, has a special interest in this connection, because he was not only a Laudian before Laud, but was the instructor of Laud in those principles which were afterwards called Laudian. He was a resident Fellow of S. John's College, Oxford (of which he afterwards became President), when Laud was an undergraduate, and was what we should now call Laud's tutor. And 'it proved,' writes Heylin,[1] 'no ordinary happiness to the scholar to be principled under such a tutor, who knew as well as any other of his time how to employ the two-edged sword of Holy Scripture, brandishing it on

[1] 'Cyprianus Anglicus,' part i., p. 44.

the one side against the Papists,[1] and on the other against the Puritans and Nonconformists.' In later years tutor and pupil joined in editing the famous sermons of the most distinguished of all the Churchmen in the period before us.

The reader will have already anticipated the name of *Lancelot Andrewes* (1555-1626), Bishop of Ely and then of Winchester. There is a certain resemblance between the position of Lancelot Andrewes in the seventeenth century and that of John Keble in the nineteenth. Just as it is difficult to realize that the humble and retiring country clergyman was 'the true and primary author of the Oxford Movement,'[2] so it is difficult to realize that the man who is chiefly known through his 'Private Devotions,' who made a point of not interfering in public affairs unless the spiritual interests of the Church required it, and who was singularly wanting in ambition, should yet have been the leading spirit in that marked development of Church principles which characterized the early part of the seventeenth century. But Andrewes, like Keble, combined with a retiring modesty an iron will and a most definite creed; and being, also like Keble, the reverse of a showy man, he possessed far more erudition than appeared on the surface. Particularly in patristic learning, which was the real strength of the Anglican position, he was far superior to any of his contemporaries or immediate predecessors.[3] Moreover, Andrewes' character gave him a moral

[1] He wrote a treatise, 'De Potestate Papæ in Temporalibus,' which had a high reputation in its day.

[2] Cardinal Newman, 'Apologia pro Vitâ suâ.'

[3] Dr. Hallam notices this in his 'Literature of Europe,' vol. ii., p. 308.

weight which perhaps no one else possessed. Not that he was in advance of his age, or by any means a perfect man. It is only too probable that he sanctioned the burning of the two heretics, Legate and Brightman, and quite certain that he voted on the wrong side in the most disgraceful Essex divorce case. But take him for all in all, we must recognise in him the veritable saint.[1] Another point must be noticed in connection with Bishop Andrewes. Laud is generally reckoned as the introducer not only of a high doctrine, but also of a high ceremonial, and what the Puritans were pleased to call 'Popish furniture,' into the Church of England. But here, again, Andrewes preceded him. His earliest biographer, Isaacson, writing of the time when Andrewes was Bishop of Ely (1605-1609), says: 'His chapel was so devoutly and reverently adorned, and God served there with so holy and reverend behaviour, that the souls of many that came thither were very much elevated; yea, some that had bin there desired to end their dayes in the Bishop of Ely's Chapel.' Thus writes a friend; an enemy enters into more details: 'The altar 1½ yards high, and a cushion, two candlesticks with tapers, the daily furniture for the altar, a cushion for the service-book, silver and gilt canisters for the wafers, like a wicker-basket and lined with Cambric lace; the tonne [flagon] upon a cradle, the chalice covered with a linen napkin (called the aire) on a credence; a little boate out of which the frankincense is poured, a tricanale for the water of mixture, the faldstory, whereat they kneel to read the

[1] For a full account of this great luminary, see Mr. Ottley's 'Lancelot Andrewes,' in the 'Leaders of Religion' series.

litany,' and so forth.[1] All this was more than twenty years before the outcry against Laud's ceremonial at the consecration of S. Catherine Cree.

It may seem strangely out of place to notice in the present connection another prelate who almost rivals Bishop Andrewes in the very high and widespread reputation he attained both for piety and learning. *Thomas Morton* (1564-1659), successively Bishop of Chester, Lichfield and Coventry, and Durham, was far indeed from being a Laudian; he was distinctly what would now be called a Low Churchman; but still he *was* a Churchman of a very definite type, and he helped largely to teach people to regard the Church, not as a mere negation, an enemy of Rome on the one hand and of Geneva on the other, but as a positive institution, capable of creating enthusiasm for its *con*structive, not its *de*structive, work. It seems to me particularly important to show the great confidence which Churchmen of the Laudian type showed in him, because the fact illustrates a phase of the movement we are considering, viz., its breadth and tolerance. This is not only often ignored, but the lack of it is thought to be the great defect of the movement. Bishop Morton was a Protestant of Protestants, the persistent and very formidable antagonist of Rome and everything tending towards Rome; he worked shoulder to shoulder with Dr. Preston, the Puritan Master of Emmanuel, in opposing the views of Bishop Montague, of whom more anon; he was a man of whom Nonconformists like Baxter and Calamy, and a bitter anti-Laudian like Prynne, could speak kindly. And yet he was not

[1] See Prynne's 'Canterburie's Doome.'

only in intimate relationship with the High Churchmen, but owed his advancement chiefly to that party. In his long life he spans the interval between the Church of the Elizabethan era and the Church of the later Caroline era, having been acquainted in his youth with Richard Hooker, and in his old age with Izaak Walton, who received much information from him in writing Hooker's biography. It was on the recommendation of the High Church Archbishop Bancroft that he was made a chaplain to King James I., and in 1606 Dean of Gloucester. It was the High Church Bishop Bilson who conferred on him the living of Alresford. He was so intimate with the High Church Dean of S. Paul's (Dr. Overall) that he used always to stay at the Deanery when he was in London; and he was translated from the bishopric of Chester to that of Lichfield and Coventry in 1618, at the special recommendation of Bishop Andrewes, 'who was never known to do the like for any other.' It was when the Laudian ascendancy was at its height (1632) that he was promoted from Lichfield to the great palatinate see of Durham, and he had among his chaplains those excellent Churchmen, John Barwick, afterwards Dean of S. Paul's, who preached his funeral sermon, and Isaac Basire, one of the many deserving scholars whom he brought forward. Thus, though certainly not identified with the Laudian Movement, he was closely connected with, and much honoured by, many of the movers. It may be added that this most estimable prelate was firm as a rock in his Churchmanship all through 'the troubles.'

These are but specimens of the men who were building up the spiritual fabric of the Church, and

that Church was training up in her definite system saintly souls whose characters bore the peculiar impress of her system. Such was *George Herbert* (1593-1633), whose conversion (to borrow a term from the other side) dates from about the year 1625; such was *John Donne* (1573-1631), scholar, poet, divine, and orator, who, after much perplexity in deciding between the conflicting claims of Roman and Anglican divines, at last found his true home in his mother Church, of which he became a most distinguished ornament; and such were others of that brilliant galaxy of sacred poets which shone so conspicuously in the early part of the seventeenth century; such was *Nicholas Ferrar* (1597-1637), a true Anglican, in spite of his Puritan training, and all that little band of thirty who, with him, made Little Gidding a sacred spot; such were many of those who afterwards became famous as the Caroline divines, but who were trained, and their principles fixed, in this school and at this time.

A striking illustration of the logical tenableness of the position of the English Church may be found in the fact that it attracted some foreigners of the highest distinction in a remarkable way. The most noted instance is that of *Isaac Casaubon* (1559-1614), the first scholar of his age, whose study of the early Fathers rendered him utterly dissatisfied with the position of the French Huguenots, among whom he had been brought up; while he could still less accept the only other alternative offered to him in his own land, *viz.*, to join the Roman Church. But he found in the English Church just what he wanted when James I., who loved to have learned men about him, invited him over to England. It was not, however,

to the arguments of the royal theologian (though he had, no doubt, often to listen to them), but to Bishop Andrewes, and Dean Overall, and Bishop Morton, that Casaubon was indebted for that perfect satisfaction and peace of mind which he found in the bosom of the Church of his adoption.[1] We may observe the same attraction to the peculiar position of the English Church, as primitive without being either ultra-Protestant or Roman, in another foreign contemporary with Casaubon, and almost as distinguished a scholar. Grotius at one time seemed to be fast hastening to the goal which Casaubon had reached, but he went off at a tangent in another direction. Something of the same sort, though less markedly connected with the English Church, happened in the case of the distinguished Lutheran, Calixtus, and also in that of Antonius de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro.[2] But to trace out these cases in detail would carry us too far afield.

While, however, the instances which have been given, and which might be multiplied tenfold, show plainly enough that Laud's views were no novelties, they do not show that such views were held by more than a small minority; the movement, before Laud, was not strong enough to stem the current which was running in the direction of Puritanism. Laud brought back the Reformed Church to what it was intended to be. He stamped upon it the conviction

[1] All this is vividly brought out by Mr. Mark Pattison in his admirable 'Life of Casaubon.' Mr. Pattison has, of course, no sympathy with the views which Casaubon adopted, and his testimony is all the more valuable on that very account. It is fully borne out by Casaubon's own 'Ephemerides.'

[2] That is, supposing this rather doubtful convert was ever really in earnest.

that it was a real part of the Church Catholic ; he gave it a positive influence which it had not possessed before. For nearly twenty years of one of the most critical periods in its history he was the one absolute power in the National Church. King, favourite, almost all the leading prelates, were ecclesiastically his creatures. It will not, therefore, be devoting a disproportionate space to one man if we enter somewhat minutely into his history.

*William Laud* (1573-1645) was born at Reading, his father being a clothier in that town. He was educated at the Reading Free School, and in 1589 proceeded to St. John's College, Oxford, where his tutor, Buckeridge, taught him Church principles, or, at any rate, strengthened him in them. In 1593 he was admitted Fellow of St. John's, and remained in residence as 'grammar reader' or tutor. He did not receive Holy Orders until January, 1600-1. In 1606 he was called to account by the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Airey, for preaching at St. Mary's a sermon containing 'Popish opinions.' Such opinions Laud certainly never held nor preached ; but Arminianism was accounted as little better than Popery in disguise, and Laud was a stout Arminian. He soon became so marked a man at Oxford, as one who desired to introduce the doctrines of Rome into the Church, that it was, he tells us, 'almost an heresy to be seen in his company, and a misprision of heresy to give him a civil salutation in the street.' This was, of course, among the Calvinian party, which then formed the immense majority at the University. But there was a small, though ever-increasing, minority of anti-Calvinists who learnt to regard him as their leader, and he attracted the

attention of the same party outside Oxford. In 1607 Sir Thomas Cave gave him the living of Stamford, in Northamptonshire; to this was added North Kilworth in 1608, which he exchanged for West Tilbury in 1609.[1] In 1608 he became chaplain to Dr. Neile, then Bishop of Rochester, his ever-constant friend and supporter; and in the same year he preached before the King at Theobald's. In 1610 Dr. Neile conferred upon him the living of Cuxton in Kent, and, very unlike the custom of the day, he resigned his Fellowship in order that he might devote himself exclusively to the duties of his parish. In 1610 his old tutor, Dr. Buckeridge, President of St. John's, was promoted to the bishopric of Rochester, vacant by the translation of his other friend, Dr. Neile, to Lichfield. Laud was elected to the presidentship, in spite of the efforts of such influential men as the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. G. Abbot) and the Lord High Chancellor (Lord Ellesmere) to exclude him on account of his Church principles. His position as one of the Heads of Houses did not shield him from attack. In 1614 he was publicly assailed from the University pulpit by the brother of the Archbishop, Dr. R. Abbot, then Master of Balliol, soon after Bishop of Salisbury, for having declared in a sermon that a Presbyterian was as bad as a Papist. Laud was not present at the sermon, so Dr. Abbot repeated it when he *was* present, and scornfully demanded of him whether he himself was a Papist or a Protestant, and made many bitter

[1] See Mr. Hutton's 'Life of Laud,' in 'English Religious Leaders' series. Churchmen owe a deep debt of gratitude to Mr. Hutton for this fascinating volume, which most ably and most moderately puts Laud's character in a right light.

personal remarks. Laud was absolutely unmoved by opposition, and made way at Oxford in spite, or perhaps in consequence of it; for it only served to call attention to his views. He soon had an opportunity of carrying his dogged determination into another field. In 1616 King James appointed him Dean of Gloucester, telling him 'there was scarce ever a church in England that was so ill governed,' and enjoining him to 'set in order what was amiss.' The new Dean found much amiss in the cathedral of Gloucester, notably in the position of the Holy Table, which stood in the middle of the choir. Laud had no difficulty in persuading the Chapter to consent to its removal to the east end, but the change deeply offended the aged Bishop, Dr. Miles Smith, the writer of the Dedication in the Authorized Version, who declared that he would never enter the cathedral until the old position was restored. The Puritans also, who constituted the majority of the citizens of Gloucester, where the traditions of the martyred Bishop Hooper still lingered on, were offended. Laud took no notice of the opposition, and, very characteristically, made no attempt whatever to win over the malcontents. He had carried his point, and that was enough for him. In 1617 he accompanied the King to Scotland, where he again gave offence, among other things, by wearing a surplice at a funeral. In 1621 he became Bishop of St. David's; he is said by some to have owed his appointment to the strong influence brought to bear upon the King by the heir-apparent, Prince Charles, and the favourite, Buckingham — by others, to Bishop Williams[1]; but it is clear that the King, though he

[1] This is strongly insisted upon by Bishop Hacket in his 'Life of the Lord Keeper Williams.'

had once distrusted him, had now a high opinion of his competency; for in the following year, 1622, James had recourse to him in a delicate and difficult matter. The Countess of Buckingham, mother of the all-powerful favourite, was being drawn towards Rome by a Jesuit Father, who went by the name of Fisher, but whose real name was Percy, or Persy. In the extreme sensitiveness to danger from Rome which then prevailed, it would have been very inconvenient if one so nearly connected with the Court had joined the Roman communion. The King, always ready to air his controversial abilities, first tried to argue with Fisher himself, but found the Jesuit more than a match for him. Then he arranged two conferences, which were to be held in the presence of the Countess, between Fisher and Dr. Francis White, at that time Rector of S. Peter's, Cornhill, afterwards promoted to the Bench.[1] The King seems to have thought Dr. White hardly a strong enough man for the work, and called in Laud, as a stronger, who held a third conference with the Jesuit. The Countess was not permanently impressed, but her son was. Buckingham henceforth took Laud for his spiritual father, and was ruled by him in ecclesiastical matters until his death. Thus, the conference with Fisher was an important era in Laud's life, being one of the chief causes of his future predominence, when Charles ruled the Church, Buckingham ruled Charles, and Laud ruled Buckingham.

It was important in another way: it showed how absolutely firm Laud felt in his position

[1] He was successively Dean of Carlisle, Bishop of Carlisle, Norwich and Ely.

in regard to Rome. He has left no more valuable writing behind him than his account of the conference with Fisher, which he afterwards (1639) published in an enlarged form.[1] It is one of the most convincing works extant on the tenableness of the Anglican position in relation to Romanism,[2] and it would be difficult to find a clearer exposition of what may be called the Laudian theory, or a better illustration of the persistent way in which Laud adhered to his point, than the following passage from the Epistle Dedicatory which I therefore venture to quote at some length :

'Let me be bold to observe to your Majesty in particular, concerning your great charge in the Church of England. She is in hard condition. She professes the ancient Catholic faith, and yet the Romanist condemns her for novelty of doctrine. She practises Church government as it hath been in use in all ages, and all places where the Church of

[1] A joint production of White and Laud was put forth in 1624 under the title of 'An Answer to Mr. Fisher's Relation of a Third Conference between a certain B. (as he styles him) and himselfe. The Conference was very private till Mr. Fisher spread certaine papers of it, which in many respects required an answer. This was given by R. B., chaplain to the B., that was employed in the Conference. Printed by Adam Islip, 1624.' 'A certain B.' was Bishop Laud, 'R. B.' was Richard Bailey, his chaplain, who married Laud's niece, and succeeded him in the living of Ibstock. The title of the later edition is, 'A Relation of the Conference betweene William Lawd, the Lord Bishop of St. David's, now Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and Mr. Fisher, the Jesuit, by the command of King James of ever blessed memorie, with an answer to such exceptions as A. C. takes against it. 1639.' 'A. C.' was Fisher himself.

[2] I give my own impression of the work ; but it is fair to add that some speak very slightingly of it.

Christ hath been established both in and since the days of the Apostles, and yet the separatist condemns her for antichristianism in her discipline. The plain truth is, she is between these two factions, as between two mill-stones, and unless your Majesty look to it, to whose trust she is committed, she will be ground to powder, to an irreparable dishonour and loss to this kingdom. And it is very remarkable, that while both these press hard upon the Church of England, both of them cry out against persecution, like froward children, who scratch, and kick, and bite, and yet cry out all the while, as if they were killed. Now, to the Romanist I shall say this: The errors of the Church of Rome are grown now (many of them) very old, and when errors are grown by age, and continuance, to strength, they which speak for the truth, though it be of an older, are usually challenged for the bringers in of new opinions. And there is no greater absurdity stirring this day in Christendom, than that the reformation of an old corrupted Church, whether we will or not, must be taken for the building of a new. And were not this so, we should never be troubled with that idle and impertinent question of theirs, Where was your Church before Luther? for it was just there, where theirs is now; one and the same Church still, no doubt of that; one in substance, but not one in condition of state and purity: their part of the same Church remaining in corruption, and our part of the same Church under reformation. The same Naaman, and he a Syrian still; but leprous with them, and cleansed with us; the same man still. And for the separatist, and him that lays his grounds for separa-

tion, or change of discipline; though all he says, or can say, be in truth of divinity, and among learned men, little better than ridiculous; yet since these fond opinions have gained some ground among the people, to such among them as are wilfully set to follow their blind guides through thick and thin, till they fall into the ditch together, I shall say nothing. But so many of them as mean well, and are only misled by artifice and cunning, concerning them I shall say thus much only, they are bells of passing good metal, and tunable enough of themselves, and in their own disposition; and a world of pity it is, that they are rung so miserably out of tune as they are by those who have acquired power in and over their consciences. And for this there is remedy enough, but how long there will be I know not.

'The Scripture, where it is plain, should guide the Church; and the Church, where there is doubt or difficulty, should expound the Scripture; yet so, as neither the Scripture should be forced, nor the Church so bound up, as that, upon just and farther evidence, she may not revive that which in any case hath slept by her. What success the great distemper, caused by the collision of two such factions, may have, I know not, I cannot prophesy. And though I cannot prophesy, yet I fear that atheism and irreligion gather strength, while the truth is thus weakened by an unworthy way of contending for it. And while they thus contend, neither party consider that they are in a way to induce upon themselves and others that contrary extreme, which they both seem to oppose and to fear. The Catholic Church of Christ is neither Rome nor a conventicle; out of that there is no salvation, I easily confess it;

but out of Rome there is, and out of a conventicle, too. Salvation is not shut up into such a narrow conclave. In this discourse, I have, therefore, endeavoured to lay open those wider gates of the Catholic Church, confined to no age, time, or place, not knowing any bounds, but that faith which was once, and but once for all, delivered to the saints. And in my pursuit of this way, I have searched after, and delivered with a single heart, that truth which I profess. In the publishing whereof I have obeyed your Majesty, discharged my duty, to my power, to the Church of England, given account of the hope that is in me, and so testified to the world that faith in which I have lived, and by God's blessing and favour purpose to die.'

We have brought the account of Laud's life up to the close of James I.'s reign. With the accession of Charles I. he became all-powerful, and his history merges into the general history of the reign, so far as the Church was concerned. This history must form the subject of a separate chapter.

## CHAPTER III.

### THE STUART PERIOD.

*From the Accession of Charles to the Opening of the Long Parliament* (1625-1640).

Case of Dr. Montague—Charles's dispute with his first Parliament—Cases of Sibthorpe and Manwaring—Cosin's 'Collection of Private Devotions'—Dissolution of Parliament in 1629—Relationship between Charles and Laud—Laud, Bishop of Bath and Wells—Translated to London—His unpopularity and influence—Declaration prefixed to Thirty-nine Articles—Instructions to the bishops—Lectureships—Collector of S. Antholin's—Efforts to restore S. Paul's—Consecration of S. Catherine Cree—Laud in Star Chamber and High Commission Court—Case of Alexander Leighton—Laud Archbishop of Canterbury—Offer of a Cardinal's hat—Position of altars and railing off of sanctuaries—Second 'Book of Sports'—Laud's multifarious activity—His Metropolitan visitation—Prelates of Laud's way of thinking—Laud Chancellor of Oxford—Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton in the Star Chamber—Laud stops encroachments on the side of Rome—Short Parliament in spring of 1640—Convocation continues to sit, and enacts seventeen canons—The *Et cetera* Oath—Long Parliament, November, 1640—Spiritual force of Laudian Movement grew—Great Churchmen during the period.

THE first fifteen years of Charles I.'s reign—that is, the only time during which he ruled as well as reigned—show a strange violation of that law which political economists call the division of labour. We find divines teaching politicians in politics, and politicians teaching divines in divinity; and the result, as might be expected, was disastrous.

Part of the *damnosa hæreditas* which James I. left to his son was the case of Dr. Montague, which was yet unsettled when Charles came to the throne. In ordinary times it would have been quite outside the domain of politics; but, owing to the strange confusion noticed above, it was made not only a political question, but a pivot on which politics turned. To understand its significance we must go back a few years.

In 1619, Dr. Richard Montague, who, among other preferments, held the rectory of Petworth, found 'certain Roman rangers' striving to draw away his flock from the Anglican to the Roman communion. He invited the intruders to a conference, which they declined, and he then put forth three theses, promising that he would himself become a Roman Catholic if any one of the three were fairly disproved. They were:

1. That the present Roman Church is neither the Catholic Church nor a sound branch of the Catholic Church.

2. That the present English Church is a sound member of the Catholic Church.

3. That none of the points which the former maintains against the latter was the perpetual doctrine of the Catholic Church.

He was answered by Dr. Matthew Kellison, President of the English College at Douay, in a pamphlet entitled 'A Gag for the Reformed Gospell.'[1] Dr. Montague immediately replied in another pamphlet, which he called 'A Gag for the New Gospel? No.

[1] This seems to have been the original title, though, in consequence of the title of Dr. Montague's reply, it is generally entitled 'A Gagg for the New Gospel.'

A new Gag for an old Goose.' Both combatants were able divines, and had won their spurs in the field of controversy. Dr. Montague was sure of his ground, and maintained it manfully; but his arguments naturally gave offence to the Puritan party, for one of his main contentions was that the Romans mistook Puritanism for Anglicanism, and that some of the doctrines attributed to the Church of England were not really the doctrines of that Church, but only of some who professed to be members of it, but had never imbibed its true spirit. 'An impartial judgment,' writes one, who is himself the most impartial, as he is certainly the best-informed historian of the period, 'will probably consider it [Dr. Montague's pamphlet] a temporate exposition of the reasons which were leading an increasing body of scholars to reject the doctrines of Rome and of Geneva alike.'[1] But this was not the view of the Puritans. Two Ipswich ministers, named Yates and Ward, complained to the House of Commons; the House referred the matter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Abbot, who remonstrated and appealed to the King. But James was a keen and well-read man; he saw at once the strength of Montague's position and supported him. Encouraged by this support, Dr. Montague published in the early part of 1625 his famous 'Appello Cæsarem, a just Appeal from two unjust Informers.' Immediately afterwards King James died, but the new Cæsar at once responded to the appeal. It was made a test question. Archbishop Abbot, the Puritan, had refused to license the pamphlet, and Dr. Francis

[1] 'History of England under the Duke of Buckingham and Charles I., 1624-1628,' by Samuel Rawson Gardiner, i. 206.

White, Bishop of Carlisle, the friend of Laud, licensed it. The House of Commons took up the matter warmly. In a hot debate, Montague was accused of 'dishonouring the late King, of disturbing Church and State, and of treating the rights and privileges of Parliament with contempt.' They appointed a committee of religion, which twice pronounced censure on the 'Appello,' and voted a petition to the King that the author should be duly punished and his book burnt; and they committed Montague to the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Montague's case was naturally taken up by the High Church party as their own. The four most notable bishops on the Arminian side, Laud of S. David's, Andrewes of Winchester, Montaigne of London, and Neile of Durham, after a conference held by command of King Charles, in January, 1625-26, reported that 'Dr. Montague hath not affirmed anything to be the doctrine of the Church of England, but which in our opinion is the doctrine of the Church of England or agreeable thereto.' Laud also, in conjunction with the Bishop of Rochester (Dr. Buckeridge) and the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Howson), wrote to the Duke of Buckingham, asking him to 'persuade the King to settle the matter by the exercise of his prerogative, and to nullify the persecution of Montague by the House of Commons.' King Charles made no secret of his partisanship; he appointed Dr. Montague his domestic chaplain, and demanded that the royal household should not be interfered with. Thus what might appear to be a purely theological question became one of the first bones of contention between Charles and the Parliament.[1]

[1] 'Methinks,' writes Laud, in reference to the Montague

But if politicians were ready to meddle with divinity, divines were quite as ready to meddle with politics. Bishop Laud set the example by preaching, at the opening both of the first and of the second Parliament of the new reign, the most exalted notions of the King's prerogative, and, in fact, identifying Church principles with prerogative government. Others were quite ready to follow his lead; the pulpits were 'tuned,' and the most extravagant assertions of the King's unlimited power were made from them. Two names, especially, emerge from the obscurity into which they would have naturally sunk — those of Dr. Sibthorpe and Dr. Manwaring. They are frequently associated with that of Dr. Montague, but neither Sibthorpe nor Manwaring had any of Montague's ability, and neither would have been famous but for his extravagance. Dr. Manwaring was one of the King's chaplains-in-ordinary, and in a sermon preached before Charles at Oatlands, July 4, 1627, he asserted that 'the King's royal command, imposing taxes and loans without the consent of Parliament, did so far bind the consciences of the subjects of this kingdom that they could not refuse the payment without peril of damnation'; and he compared those who refused to Korah, Dathan and Abiram. In a second sermon, on the 29th of the same month, he affirmed that the authority of Parliament was not necessary for the raising of aids and subsidies; and he repeated these doctrines of absolution in his own parish church, S. Giles-in-the-Fields. Dr. Sibthorpe uttered similar

---

question, 'I see a cloud arising, and threatening the Church of England. God of His mercy dissipate it.'

sentiments in an assize sermon at Northampton,[1] and others followed.

But there was another, and greater, name which, with far less provocation, fell under the strictures of the Commons, that of John Cosin. King Charles found that the Court ladies were using Roman Catholic books of devotion, as was not unnatural in the Court of a vehement proselytizer like Queen Henrietta Maria, especially as Anglican books of devotion were rare. He therefore commissioned *John Cosin* (1594-1672), then Archdeacon of the East Riding, and Rector of Brancepeth, afterwards the famous Bishop of Durham, to prepare a devotional book suitable for English Churchpeople. Cosin was a personal friend both of Laud and Montague, and thoroughly sympathized with their theological views; he would, therefore, naturally have a very different idea of what was 'suitable for English Churchmen' from that of the Puritans. His 'Collection of Private Devotions' was published in 1627, and gave as much offence as Montague's pamphlets and Manwaring's sermons had done. It was, as the title indicates, a 'Collection' from ancient offices; there was nothing original in it; and it was perfectly absurd to call it, as many did, a 'Popish book,' for Cosin was a lifelong enemy of Rome. But its whole tone and character were markedly anti-Puritan; it was, in fact, a product of that Sacramental system which was fast gaining ground in the English Church. It was bitterly attacked by William Prynne and Richard Baxter, and the com-

[1] Archbishop Abbot refused to license the printing of Sibthorpe's sermon, and was temporarily suspended from the exercise of his authority in consequence; but Laud licensed the sermon.

mittee of religion in the House of Commons was ordered to inquire into and report upon the case.[1] However, in 1629, before the report was finished, Parliament was dissolved, not to meet again for nearly eleven years. The matter therefore was allowed to drop.

Meanwhile Laud went on his course, totally unmoved by the clamours which were raised. He had one definite object which he kept steadily in view, the purging of the Church from Calvinism and Puritanism, and the restoring of it to that which it was meant to be—the ancient Church of the country, freed from the mediæval accretions by which it had become encrusted. The means he used were not so

[1] Evelyn gives the following interesting account of the matter in his 'Diary': 'Dean Cosin told me the occasion of publishing those offices which among the Puritans were wont to be called Cosin's "Cozening Devotions" by way of derision. At the first coming of the Queen into England, she and her French ladies were often upbraiding our religion that had neither appointed nor set forth any hours of prayer nor breviaries, by which ladies and courtiers which have much spare time might edify and be in devotion, as they had. Our Protestant ladies moved the matter to the King, who asked Bishop White whether there might not be found some forms of prayer proper on such occasions collected out of some already-approved forms. Bishop White said, "Easily"; and the King commanded him to employ some clergyman, and he employed Cosin. Cosin said: "There was not anything in the whole book of my own composition, nor did I set any man as author to it, but only those necessary prefaces out of the Fathers touching the times and seasons of prayer, all the rest being entirely translated and collected out of an office published by authority of Queen Elizabeth, anno 1560, and our own liturgy. This I mention, because our Dean has exceedingly suffered for it, as if he had done it out of his own head to introduce Popery, from which no man was more averse.' Dr. Cosin was Dean of Peterborough before he was appointed Bishop of Durham.

much the enactment of new laws; in the existing state of the country that would have been impossible. Nor did he deem it necessary; the enforcement of the law as it stood would be quite sufficient for his purpose, and he set himself to ride over every obstacle in the way of its enforcement. He was warmly supported by the King, whose prerogative he exalted to the very highest pitch. Charles I. was the first Sovereign since the Reformation in whose favour anything like enthusiasm could be raised in the breasts of Churchmen *as* Churchmen. Henry VIII. had rendered all that followed possible; but it was impossible to set him up as a hero, or even as a decently respectable Christian; Edward VI. had died too young; Mary was a name which called forth only execration; Elizabeth was justly regarded with pride by patriots, but she was too much of the earth, earthy, to be a spiritual heroine; James I. had been a firm and able defender of the Church, but he was too ludicrous a personage to be set up as a hero of any kind. But Charles I. was at least one over whom a glamour could be thrown. He was neither immoral like Henry, nor worldly like Elizabeth, nor ridiculous like James. A grave, decorous man, with a sincere attachment to the English Church and a thorough knowledge of its system, with a dignified presence, an interesting, melancholy face, and a power of attracting his friends, he might, from one point of view, be regarded as the model of a Christian, worthy of the martyr's crown which he won. There was, indeed, another side to his character, which rendered him a most dangerous man to place at the head of affairs either in Church or State[1]; but

[1] Laud seems to have had some inkling of this when he

this did not appear upon the surface, and, as a rule, men do not look below the surface. Laud could do in the case of Charles what he could never have done in the case of James: he could invest him with 'the divinity that doth hedge a king'; and he did it.[1]

Hence, most unfortunately, Churchmanship became identified in men's minds with absolutism, and Puritanism with civil and religious liberty. The situation was this: The King was to be absolutely supreme in temporals, and Laud was to support him; Laud was to be absolutely supreme in spirituals, and the King was to support him.

One of the first acts of King Charles was to ask Laud who among the clergy deserved promotion, and Laud gave him, through Buckingham, a list with each name marked 'O' or 'P'—that is, Orthodox or Puritan.[2] By degrees the chief offices in the Church were filled by men who sympathized, more

describes Charles as 'a mild and gracious Prince, who knew not how to be, nor to be made, great.' See Laud's 'Diary.'

[1] To prevent misconception, I must be allowed to refer to two articles on Archbishop Laud which appeared in the *Church Quarterly Review* in April and July respectively, 1895, from which the above and several other passages in the following pages will appear to have been borrowed. This is not plagiarism, unless it be plagiarism to borrow from one's self. The reader is referred to the two articles in question for a fuller account of the writer's views about Laud than the limits of this work will allow.

[2] It is thought by some that the list ('schedula') of clergy to be marked 'O' and 'P' only referred to the royal chaplains, who had, of course, to be reappointed at the beginning of a new reign; but Laud himself makes no such limitation. See 'Diary' for April 5, 1625: 'Die martis schedulam exhibui, in quâ nomina erant virorum ecclesiasticorum sub literis 'O' et 'P.' Nomina ut sic digererem jussit ipse dux Buckingamiæ traditurus ea (ut dixit), Regi Carolo.'

or less, with the Laudian Movement. Laud himself was rapidly advanced. In 1626 he was translated from the distant see of S. David's to that of Bath and Wells, where he would be nearer the centre of events. In the same year Charles made him Dean of the Chapels Royal, in place of his deceased friend Bishop Andrewes, and in the following a Privy Councillor. In 1628, just after the famous Remonstrance had been made by the House of Commons to the King, in which Laud was expressly named as the introducer of innovations,[1] he became Bishop of London, where he was in his element. London was always a stronghold of Puritanism, and at that time the discipline of the Church in the Metropolis had been much relaxed under the indolent sway of Bishop Montaigne; so Laud's difficulties and his unpopularity were of course increased tenfold by his translation. But this was just what he desired. When there was a difficulty to be grappled with, he rose at once to the occasion; and as to unpopularity, sensitive though he was, he really seems to have welcomed it as a cross to bear: he certainly never made the slightest effort to avert it. 'He courted,' writes Clarendon, 'persons too little, nor cared to make his designs appear as candid and sincere as they were.'

He had now no rival. Archbishop Abbot had almost ceased to make any efforts in behalf of that Puritanism of which he had long been the champion. The Lord Keeper Williams, with his policy of compromise, had succumbed to Laud, with his policy of 'Thorough.' The only man who might have influenced or modified that policy from the Church standpoint, Bishop Andrewes, had died in 1626,

[1] See Laud's 'Diary' for June 14, 1628.

without casting his mantle upon anyone.[1] Even the murder of the Duke of Buckingham, Laud's 'patron and pupil,' though it might seem to lessen, really increased his power, for it removed the only councillor who could at all rival his influence with the King.

In the first year of his incumbency of the see of London (1628) he persuaded the King to put forth the 'Declaration' which is still prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles in our Prayer-Book. The object of that 'Declaration' was to meet the allegation that, 'considering the known opinions of some of the compilers of those Articles, they might be signed in a sense which they do not bear on the surface'; the meaning of each Article must be taken in its literal and grammatical sense, and no other—which, being interpreted, means that the Puritans had been wont to read into the Articles the supposed mind of their compilers, and so to give them a kind of Calvinistic twist. This was not to be done.

In 1630 the 'Declaration' was followed by 'Instructions,' of which again Laud, in conjunction with the Archbishop of York (Dr. Harsnet), was the real author. The Instructions were to be imposed by the archbishops upon the bishops of their respective provinces. They were of a very wide range, but they all tended to the one object which Laud had in view, the building up of the Church throughout the country on a non-Calvinistic basis. This could not be done if the chief builders, the bishops, were absent

[1] Laud writes in his 'Diary' for September 25, 1626: 'Monday, about four o'clock in the morning, died Lancelot Andrewes, the most worthy Bishop of Winchester, the great light of the Christian world.'

from their proper scene of action. The Instructions therefore enjoined that bishops should 'abide in their dioceses, residing in their episcopal houses, and attending to their ordinations and their visitations with greater regularity.' The multiplication of private chaplains was a great hindrance to the carrying out of Laud's system, for their duties were mainly confined to individual families; they were therefore, to a great extent, outside the circle of general work, and could defy that strict discipline which it was Laud's aim to enforce throughout the Church, even if they did not become a scandal by sinking into mere 'trencher-chaplains.' The Instructions therefore required that the appointment of private chaplains should be strictly limited to those who were permitted by the law to enjoy such a luxury.

But the point on which the Instructions chiefly insisted was the strict regulation of the system of lectureships. No doubt Laud would have preferred to have swept away this system altogether. Under any circumstances it must have offended his ideas of order, for it was an excrescence upon the regular Church system, and had no sanction in primitive antiquity. But when, in addition to its irregularity, it was used exclusively for the establishment and extension of Puritanism, it might well be an abomination to his eyes. It was, however, too deeply rooted to be destroyed at a blow, but its tendency to thwart his plans might be checked. The lecturer held a license from the Bishop of the diocese, but he was quite independent of the parish priest, and was very often a thorn in his side. He was not obliged to use the Church service; he was

simply to lecture. Arrayed in his Geneva cloak, he could, and often did, unsay in the afternoon what had been said by the incumbent in the morning. The lectureship was generally in private patronage, and Puritan parishioners were ready to subscribe handsomely towards funds for the maintenance of men who could be made powerful engines for the spread of Puritanism through the parish pulpits. The Instructions required that lecturers should be vested in surplices, and read the whole of the Church service before commencing their lectures, and that no lecturer maintained by a corporation should be allowed to preach at all unless he was prepared to accept a cure of souls, if offered to him. These Instructions would, at least, clip the wings of these irregular officers.

In his own diocese Laud came to closer quarters with the lecturers. Some London Puritans had formed themselves into a society called the 'Collectors of S. Antholin's,' the object of which was to buy up tithes which had fallen into the hands of laymen, and out of the income to pay lecturers or schoolmasters to propagate their views. In 1630 Peter Heylin, Laud's chaplain and biographer, preached a sermon against the arrangement, and Laud determined, if possible, to dissolve the society, though its members offered to submit themselves to his directions. The case was tried in 1632 in the Exchequer Chamber, when the 'Feoffees for Impropriations' (as they were technically termed) were charged by the Attorney-General (Noy) with illegally holding property without the consent of the King; the Court decided against them, and their patronage was forfeited to the Crown.

But Laud's energies were not entirely spent in putting down Puritanism; he was also busily engaged in setting up another system in its place. One feature of this system was an ornate worship with a suggestive symbolism. He naturally desired to see the great cathedral church of his own diocese the centre of such a worship, but there was much to be done before this could be brought about. First came the money question. An enormous sum had to be spent upon S. Paul's before it could be the Christian temple that Laud desired to see it. He did not complete his task, but during his five years' incumbency of the see of London he raised no less a sum than £100,000 towards the object, fines for recusancy and other misdemeanours coming in very conveniently to swell the funds. But the money question was not the only one. The aisles of the cathedral had become a lounge for idlers, if not worse. 'Paul's Walk' was a place for assignations, and Laud set himself with characteristic energy to purge the sacred building of this vile irreverence. He succeeded partially, but the sacrilege of Paul's Walk was not entirely swept away.

In 1631 he had an opportunity of showing what his own idea of worship was. As bishop of the diocese he had to consecrate the church of S. Catherine Cree in the city. He used, with a few alterations and additions, the consecration service drawn up by his friend, Bishop Andrewes, and adopted a most elaborate ceremonial; this raised the wildest excitement and opposition, quite disproportionate to its importance; and it was one of the most telling counts brought against him at his trial, fourteen years later.

How far Laud is responsible for the harsh measures of the Star Chamber and High Commission Court is not very clear, but he was certainly a member of both ; and he was not the man to be an uninfluential member of any body to which he belonged. In 1629 Dr. Alexander Leighton, father of the estimable Archbishop Leighton, published in Holland a work entitled 'An Appeal to Parliament; or, Sion's Plea against Prelacy,' which soon found its way to England. It was a work which even in milder times could hardly have escaped official censure. Passing over its abuse of the bishops, whom the writer calls 'men of blood,' 'the trumpery of Antichrist,' 'enemies to God and the State,' it is obvious that it was a direct incentive to civil war; it was, in fact, as it has been called, 'an appeal to political Presbyterianism to take the sword in hand.' No Government in the world would tolerate such expressions as Leighton uses concerning the consort of the reigning Sovereign: she is 'the daughter of Heth,' 'a Canaanite,' 'an idolatress.' In 1630 the writer very naturally found himself in Newgate, from whence he was conveyed to be tried in the Star Chamber. Of course he was found guilty, but there was a barbarism about the sentence which was passed upon him which reminds one more of the proceedings of Ojibbeway Indians than of English Christians. The reader may be spared the disgusting details. Leighton survived it all, and wrote in 1646 an 'Epitome' of his sufferings, in which he declares that when Laud heard the sentence, he 'off with his cap, and, holding up his hands, gave thanks to God who had given him the victory over his enemies.' But this is not confirmed by any other evidence.

In 1633 Archbishop Abbot died, and Laud, who had long been virtually, became actually Primate. He was immediately afterwards twice offered a Cardinal's hat.[1] It was probably thought that he was a Papist at heart, and might be induced by the prize to declare himself openly; for Rome could as little understand his position as Geneva could. Laud, however, understood it perfectly well himself, and his new office enabled him to make it better understood by others. In regard to Rome, he had never once diverged from the line he took in the controversy with Fisher. Indeed, at the very time when he became Archbishop he was engaged in correspondence with that very able man, William Chillingworth, who was his godson, and who had been persuaded by the same Fisher to join the Roman communion and become a student at the Jesuit College at Douay. Laud's influence persuaded him to leave Douay, and eventually to return to the Church of England.

When he became Archbishop, Laud set in order the Archbishop's chapel at Lambeth, placing the

[1] There have been so many comments on and explanations of these strange offers, that it will be best to give Laud's account of them in his own words, and leave the reader to explain them as he thinks best:

'*August* 4, 1633.—There came one to me seriously, and that avowed ability to perform it, and offered me to be a Cardinal. ' went presently to the King, and acquainted him both with the thing and person.

'*August* 17.—I had a serious offer made me again to be a Cardinal. . . . But my answer was, that somewhat dwelt within me, which would not suffer that, till Rome were other than it is.'—'Diary,' p. 219.

Could the 'one who came to him' have been the Queen herself?

altar at the east end. The position of the altar had long been a matter of dispute. In 1626 the battle had been fought at Grantham, where the Vicar had insisted, against the wishes of the churchwardens and the parishioners, upon placing the altar at the east end of the parish church. The question had been referred to the Bishop of the diocese, the Lord Keeper Williams, who strove characteristically to settle it by a compromise. The altar might stand ordinarily at the east end, but when it was to be used it was to be brought into the middle of the church, 'that no one might suspect any intention of reviving the Popish idea of the Mass.' This was, of course, virtually a decision in favour of the Puritans, and in later years Bishop Williams sided with them more unhesitatingly; for though he allowed the altar to stand at the east end, both in his own chapel at Buckden, and also in Lincoln Cathedral, and in the collegiate church of Westminster, of which he was Dean, he ordered that 'the Holy Tables in parish churches' in his diocese should be 'placed in the middle of the chancels and railed in.' In consequence of this order, Laud suspended the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Lincoln, when he made his metropolitical visitation. The Bishop claimed exemption from being visited, and the case was brought first before the Attorney-General, and then before the Privy Council, and both decided in favour of Laud. It was also through Laud that the sanctuaries within which the Holy Mysteries were celebrated began to be railed off.

In 1633 King Charles republished, with a supplement, 'The Book of Sports,' which had caused so much sensation when it had been put forth by his

father fifteen years before. The revival of the Sabbath question was probably due to Laud; at any rate, the blame of it fell upon him. 'It' ('The Book of Sports') 'was ushered in,' he says, 'with this scorn upon me, "that I laboured to put on a badge of holiness by my breath upon places, and to take it away from days."' His 'breath upon places' refers to his consecration of S. Catherine Cree and S. Giles-in-the-Fields, and his attempts to enforce reverence in churches generally.

The lawfulness of recreations upon the Lord's Day was not more disputed than the lawfulness of one particular kind of recreation, that of stage-plays, on any day; and Laud threw himself as heartily into the latter dispute as into the former, speaking warmly against Prynne's book, entitled 'Histriomastix' (The Actor's Scourge), when that matter was brought before the Star Chamber, 1634.

The variety of the directions in which Laud expended his energies is extraordinary. Now we find him composing a new body of statutes for his own cathedral at Canterbury; now enjoining the use of copes in all cathedrals and college chapels; now insisting upon the use of the English liturgy, translated into their own languages, in those chapels in which foreigners worshipped; or, if these foreigners had become naturalized, insisting upon their attendance at their parish churches, because, he said, their conventicles, especially in London, only encouraged schism; now requiring the use of the liturgy in the English regiments in the Dutch service, and, again, in the church of the Merchant Adventurers at Delft; now insisting upon candidates for Holy Orders having proper titles to Orders before they were ordained.

For three years (from 1634 to 1637) his Vicar-General, Sir Nathaniel Brent, went about as the Archbishop's representative on a metropolitan visitation from one diocese to another, enforcing conformity in all. Laud had by this time nearly purged the Church of Puritanism in high places, and was surrounded by prelates more or less of his own way of thinking. Richard Neile, his former patron and still firm friend, was Archbishop of York; William Juxon, a man of very different temperament, but of similar Church views, was in the important see of London; Francis White, his fellow-controversialist against Fisher, was at Ely; John Bancroft, nephew of the penultimate Archbishop of Canterbury, and inheritor of his principles, was at Oxford; Richard Corbet, who, as Bishop of Oxford, had always taken Laud's part in his disputes with the Oxford Puritans, was at Norwich; Walter Curll at Winchester, where he restored and beautified the cathedral quite after the Laudian model; Joseph Hall, who under Laud's own influence was fast passing from a mild type of Puritan to a mild type of Anglican, at Exeter. His own University, of which he was now Chancellor, and to which he had already become a noble benefactor, had become subservient to him, and received cheerfully in its Convocation a body of statutes which he codified and sent to it in 1636.[1] His old enemy,

[1] Laud's priceless services to the University of Oxford, and hence to the cause of learning generally, are acknowledged on all hands. Under the evil chancellorship of the Earl of Leicester, Oxford had sunk to the lowest ebb, morally and intellectually; whereas Cambridge, which had had for its chancellors two of the very best men of their day—Bishop Fisher and Sir W. Cecil, afterwards Lord Burghley—had far outstripped her elder

Bishop Williams, who at one time seemed likely to be his rival, had fallen into disgrace, having been prosecuted in the Star Chamber for 'revealing the King's secrets' as a Privy Councillor. In fact, Laud was all-powerful, and the King approved of everything he did. If he heard some faint mutterings of the approaching storm, he knew how to silence them, and adopted, without the slightest compunction, severe measures for doing so. Three of these mutterers, William Prynne, Henry Burton, and John Bastwick, were brought up for sentence in the Star Chamber in 1637. The provocation given by all three was very great, for the language which they had spoken, and, still worse, printed, against the Church passed all bounds of decency and moderation;[1] but their punishment was barbarous, and, together with that of Leighton, did more harm to the Church cause than anything which they had written against it.[2]

---

and once more efficient sister in every way. To Laud more than any man Oxford owed her revival. Huber, who is very far from agreeing with Laud's theological views, fully admits this, and generously attributes to Laud the cleansing of 'this Augean stable of Leicester.' See Huber's 'English Universities,' vol. ii., p. 47; also vol. i., pp. 313, 325, 327, 351, 353, 356.

[1] For specimens of their abuse of the bishops, and, indeed, of the clergy generally, see Hook's 'Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury,' Laud, vol. xi., ch. xxxvi., pp. 290-293.

[2] It is only fair to give Laud's own account of the matter. Having spoken of 'the rage and hatred of the people,' 'who,' he says, 'were highly offended with me because I hindered and punished (as by law I might) their conventicles and separation from the Church of England,' he goes on: 'And though I pitied them, as God knows, from my very heart, yet because necessity of government forced me to some punishment, their malignity never gave me over. Among and above the rest there were three men—Mr. Henry Burton, a minister beneficed in Friday

Laud was equally alert to stop any encroachments on the side of Rome. The Pope did not even yet despair of winning back the island Church to the Roman obedience; he would naturally be encouraged in his hopes by the reports he heard of the Roman tendency of the new movement; he had a most persistent and uncompromising ally in the Queen, Henrietta Maria, who had great influence over the King, if she had not much over the Church and nation. He sent therefore a legate called Panzani on a mission to England, about the year 1635. The King, under the influence of the Queen, appears to have been inclined to lend a favourable ear to him; but he was soon stopped by Laud, who showed a true insight into the Papal policy when he told Charles that 'if he wished to go to Rome the Pope would not stir a step to meet him.' About two years later another Papal agent, called Con or Conn, a Scotchman, who had been sent in the place of Panzani, really did make many converts, and Laud again stood in the breach. He complained in the Council

---

Street, London; Dr. John Bastwick, a physician; and Mr. William Pryn, a common lawyer—who were censured Junii 14, 1637, in the Star Chamber for notorious libels printed and published by them against the hierarchy of the Church. They were then and there sentenced to stand in the pillory, and lose their ears; and because they should not stay further to infect London, they were sent away by order of that court, Mr. Burton to Guernsey, Dr. Bastwick to Scilly, and Mr. Pryn to Jersey. In the giving of this sentence I spake my conscience, and was afterwards commanded to print my speech; but I gave no vote, because they had fallen in many passages so personally upon me that I doubted many men might think spleen, and not justice, led me to it. Nor was it my counsel that advised their sending into those remote parts' ('History of Troubles and Trial,' ch. v., pp. 389, 390).

of the favour which was being shown to Roman Catholics, and singled out two well-known cases. One was that of Walter Montagu, son of the Earl of Manchester, who was not only a convert, but an active proselytizer, and Laud demanded that he should be prosecuted before the Court of High Commission; the other was that of Sir Toby Matthew, son of the Archbishop of York of that name. Laud procured that both should be expelled from the Court, and thereby incurred the displeasure of the Queen, who had never been very favourably disposed towards him. 'I am,' he writes to his friend Wentworth, 'between two great factions, very like corn between two millstones.' But the royal displeasure did not divert him from his purpose. He persuaded the King to issue a proclamation threatening the penalties of the law against Roman Catholics; but it was a threat and nothing more. In spite, however, of this stand against Rome, Laud was still suspected of favouring her cause, and, to disarm such suspicions, he published, at the instance of the King, in 1639, an enlarged account of his conference with Fisher, held fifteen years before.[1]

Laud's active career was fast drawing to a close. In April, 1640, Parliament met, after an interval of

[1] Dr. Lingard, with his usual fairness, freely admits that neither Charles nor Laud had any leaning towards Rome. 'Both Charles and his adviser, Laud, were aware that the Puritans accused them of harbouring a secret design to restore the ancient creed and worship. The charge was groundless. It originated in that intolerant zeal which mistook moderation for apostasy, and was propagated by those whom interest or patriotism had rendered hostile to the measures of Government' ('History of England,' vol. ii., ch. iv., p. 182).

eleven years, but its existence was short-lived. It was dissolved on May 5; but Convocation continued to sit, the King having obtained the opinion of the Crown lawyers that 'The Convocation called by the King's Writ under the Great Seal doth continue until it be dissolved by writ or commission under the Great Seal, notwithstanding that the Parliament be dissolved.' The immediate object of the King in desiring that Convocation should continue to sit was that it might complete the execution of a subsidy which it granted to his Majesty; but it also ratified the famous 'Canons of 1640,' seventeen in number, which are so important historically that their titles must be here given. They are:

1. Concerning the Regal Power (which stated in strong terms the doctrine of the Divine right of kings).
2. For the Better Keeping of the Day of his Majesty's most Happy Inauguration.
3. For the Suppressing of the Growth of Popery.
4. Against Socinianism.
5. Against Sectaries.
6. An Oath enjoined for the Preventing of all Innovations in Doctrine and Government.
7. A Declaration concerning some Rites and Ceremonies.
8. Of Preaching for Conformity.
9. One Book of Articles of Inquiry to be used at all Parochial Visitations.
10. Concerning the Conversation of the Clergy.
11. Chancellors' Patents.
12. Chancellors alone not to Censure any of the Clergy in Sundry Cases.

13. Excommunication and Absolution not to be Pronounced but by a Priest.
14. Concerning Commutations and the Disposing of them.
15. Touching Concurrent Jurisdiction.
16. Concerning Licenses to Marry.
17. Against Vexatious Citations.

These canons were passed quietly in both Houses, the only serious interruption being the opposition of Dr. Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, in the Upper House, who denied the power of this synod to enact canons, though he admitted its authority to levy subsidies. Bishop Goodman, however, had probably a strong reason for objecting to one at least of the canons, the third, for he was a Romanist at heart, and afterwards joined the Roman Church. But the calm was a delusive one. At first whispers, and then violent outcries, arose, both against the canons themselves and against the presumption of Convocation in framing them at such a season; and, as we shall see, this action of Convocation was afterwards one of the most telling counts against Archbishop Laud, its President. The most obnoxious of all was the sixth canon, which contained the famous *Et cetera* Oath, in which the clergyman swears that he will never 'give his consent to alter the government of this Church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, etc., as it is now established.' Were the whole body of the clergy to swear to some vague thing, they did not know what? What lay under that mysterious 'etc.'? Canon Joyce ingeniously points out that in the third canon the mystery is

explained: 'Archbishops and bishops, deans, archdeacons, *all having exempt or peculiar jurisdiction, with their several chancellors, commissaries, and officials, all persons entrusted with the cure of souls*,' the 'etc.' being introduced, in a rather unbusiness-like way, it must be admitted, merely to avoid vain repetition.[1] However, the outcry was so great that Laud was obliged, by the King's orders, to suspend the oath. This was really his last public act, for soon afterwards the Long Parliament met (November 3, 1640) and with its meeting Laud's power fell. With his fall, the edifice he had so perseveringly raised seemed to crumble to pieces; but this was not so. The Church, as Laud understood it, was forcibly kept down by the hand of power; but it never lost its hold upon the hearts of Churchmen, and after a short period of abeyance it rose again in far greater strength than it had ever possessed in Laud's lifetime. The Laudian Movement has sometimes been called the 'Laudian Reaction,' and rightly so, though what was intended as a term of reproach really indicated the cause of its strength. It *was* 'a reaction'—that is, a going back, not, however, to Rome, but to the first principles of the English Reformation, those principles which differentiated the revolt against Rome in England from the revolts against her in Scotland and on the Continent. Its close connection with political absolutism, though apparently of its essence, was really nothing more than an accident (to use the terms of logic). Its spiritual force remained and grew when its temporal props were removed; and its effects are very apparent, even up to the present day.

[1] Joyce's 'England's Sacred Synods,' ch. xiv., p. 675.

In the picture of the Church in the time of Charles I.'s power, the figure of Laud stands out so very prominently that it casts all other figures into the shade. It seems as if Laud *was* the Church during those fifteen years, and that he held a similar position to that of Joseph in the prison: 'Whatsoever they did there, he was the doer of it.'

And yet, when we come to look into the matter, we find that, apart from Laud, the Church was more strongly manned in the days of Charles than in the days of Elizabeth—more strongly, indeed, than in any part of the sixteenth century. Robert Southey boldly asserts that 'the Church of England at that time [the time of Charles I.] was better provided with able and faithful ministers than it had ever been before;'[1] and if we take 'ever before' to mean 'ever since the commencement of the Reformation,' as Southey evidently intended, the assertion is literally true. A mere enumeration of a few of its luminaries will show this. Thomas Morton (1563-1659), Joseph Hall (1574-1656), Matthew Wren (1585-1667), William Juxon (1582-1663), Robert Sanderson (1587-1662), Brian Duppa (1588-1662), John Cosin (1595-1671)—where shall we stop?—had all come well to the front before the period embraced in this chapter closes. But most of them will come before us more prominently in connection with a later period; while Laud's influence was predominant, they were thrown into the background.

[1] 'Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey,' vi. 222.

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE STUART PERIOD.

*From the Opening of the Long Parliament to the Restoration of the Monarchy* (1640-1660).

National Church in abeyance for twenty years—To its great ultimate advantage—Meeting of Long Parliament an opportunity for malcontents—Petitions pour in—Bishop Williams comes to the front—Cosin sequestered from all his benefices—Bishop Wren imprisoned—Laud attacked in the Commons—And in the Lords—Impeached by the Commons before the Lords—Committed to the Tower—Hostility to Charles and Laud in London—Not so much in the country—Root and Branch Bill rejected—Commissioners sent into the country to purge the churches—Committee of Religion to consider objections against the Church—Bishop Williams' scheme — Smectymnian Controversy — Appointments to vacant sees—The Remonstrance and Petition to the King—Bishops excluded from House of Lords—Prynne publishes Laud's 'Diary'—Trial of Laud—Ordinance of attainder substituted for impeachment—His execution—Root and Branch Bill passed as a condition of Scotch aid—Westminster Assembly of Divines—Solemn League and Covenant—Committee for Scandalous Ministers—Committee for Plundered Ministers—'Directory for Public Worship'—Churchmen not silent—The Assembly's Catechisms—Presbyterianism established as the national religion—Sufferings of the clergy—Purging of the Universities—Second Civil War and triumph of army—Cromwell's religious views and policy — The Independent platform established — 'The Engagement' substituted for the Covenant—Cromwell's 'Triers'—Clergy debarred from being private chaplains

or schoolmasters—Instances of continued life of Church—'Lectureships' utilized—Country clergy connived at—Confidence of Churchmen—Private ordinations—Training of a future ministry—Valuable literary work done.

STRICTLY speaking, the twenty years which this chapter covers hardly come within our scope, for the Church of England ceased to be a 'National Church.' It is true that the formal abolition of episcopacy did not take place until 1646, but from the day when the Long Parliament began to sit (November 3, 1640), the cause of Church and King alike was virtually lost. So far, however, from passing lightly over those twenty years as a time when the National Church was in abeyance, it is necessary to notice them most carefully, for within no similar period in her eventful history was the Church's character more distinctly moulded; none left more lasting traces behind it.

The Church *required* a little adversity, to teach her what her true position really was, and how deeply her system was rooted in the heart of the nation. During these twenty years the experiment was made, how far the nation could do without that great national institution, which was at least 200 years older than itself, and a most dismal failure it proved. The 'sorry substitutes,' as Archdeacon Perry justly terms them, which, one after another, were tried in place of the ancient Church of the land, had their little day, and then the vast majority of Englishmen returned to their old love with more than their old ardour.

For at least 150 years after the Restoration, the general tone of Englishmen in speaking and writing of the time when Puritanism was triumphant is one

of unmitigated disgust;[1] and in speaking and writing of 'our happy establishment in Church and State,' one of the utmost complacency. Then followed a very natural reaction, and during the greater part of the present century the majority of historians have certainly leaned, more or less, towards the Puritan side of the question.[2] That question has been complicated by the fact that two entirely different matters have become inextricably mixed up. Civil and religious liberty is one thing; the maintenance of a National Church is quite another. The two could perfectly well co-exist; there is no inherent incompatibility between them, but, unfortunately, as a matter of fact, they had become antagonistic; and thus the honourable name of 'patriot' became opposed to the honourable name of 'Churchman,' to the great detriment both of patriotism and of Churchmanship. The leading men of the Long Parliament were many of them high-minded patriots, and some of them personally Churchmen; but they were responsible for the downfall of the National Church. That downfall was not sudden. For

[1] Of course, there are many exceptions, notably Daniel Neal, whose 'History of the Puritans,' published at intervals, from 1732 to 1738, is the most exhaustive account of the subject extant, though its bias is very marked.

[2] The turn of the tide may perhaps be dated from the publication of the English translation of Ranke's 'History of England principally in the Seventeenth Century,' in 1870. Professor S. R. Gardiner's unique and invaluable labours in the same field have done and are doing much to give men a truer knowledge of the period, and so far as the Church is concerned, the whole tendency of the Oxford Movement has, of course, been to lead men back to the older estimate. Neither Ranke nor Gardiner can be regarded as partial to Churchmen; they simply tell the truth.

years men had been chafing against the measures of Charles and Laud; but when there was no Parliament, what court was there to which they could appeal? It would have been worse than useless to attempt to bring their grievances before the Star Chamber or the High Commission Court; those grievances did not fall within the cognizance of the ordinary courts of justice. The Short Parliament, which sat in the spring of 1640, was abruptly dissolved after about three weeks' sitting (April 13 to May 5). But when the King's exigencies[1] compelled him most reluctantly to call together the Long Parliament in the autumn, there was at last an opportunity for malcontents to give vent to their complaints. The long-pent-up forces broke forth in a mighty torrent, which carried all before it. The Puritans, and those Puritanically inclined, saw at once that their time had come at last. Petitions came pouring in to the House of Commons from all sides, and the House was ready enough to receive them.

Besides the known characters of the men who composed the new Parliament, a slight but very significant indication of their leanings was given in their first religious act. On the first Sunday after the meeting of Parliament, the members in a body received the Holy Communion from the hands of Bishop Williams, Dean of Westminster, the Holy Table being placed on that occasion in the middle

[1] The disturbances in Scotland, to put down which required money, led to the calling of the Short Parliament in April; but it sat for too short a time to grant the necessary supplies, and hence the Long Parliament was summoned to meet in November.

of the church by the express order of the House. Here were two straws which showed unmistakably which way the wind was blowing. The celebrant was, in one sense, the leader of the party that opposed Laud; the position of the Holy Table was one of the crucial tests whereby Puritans and Anglicans were distinguished.

The subjects of the petitions sent in to the House included, so far as religious and ecclesiastical matters were concerned, all those points which had long been bones of contention between the two parties. The High Commission and other ecclesiastical courts, Sunday recreations, the position of the Holy Table at the east end or in the middle of the church, the placing it 'table-wise' or 'altar-wise,' the bowing or, as it was called, the 'cringing' towards it, the bowing at the name of Jesus, the refusal of the Sacred Elements to those who would not come up to the altar-rails to receive them, but above all the new canons framed at 'the reverend new synod made of the old Convocation';[1] and, among these, especially 'the bottomless perjury of an *Et cetera* Oath'—these were the matters with which Parliament was asked to deal.

But before these general questions could be

[1] This strange expression illustrates what has been already said (see *supra*, vol. i. 253, etc.) about the confusion which has existed in regard to the origin, characters, and functions of our Convocations. The Church view of them is that they are simply the provincial synods of the two provinces of Canterbury and York respectively; but those who regard them as assemblies, dating only from the time of Edward I., and corresponding to Parliament—in fact, 'clerical Parliaments'—would naturally draw a distinction, which is in reality utterly unfounded, between a 'synod' and a 'convocation.'

attended to, the cases of some individuals had to be settled. Bishop Williams, the late Lord Keeper, had been released from his prison, and became for a very short time a power in the land. The House voted that, by an ingenious retaliation, Prynne, Bastwick and Burton should be compensated for the sufferings they had endured, by large sums of money extracted from Laud and other ecclesiastics who had been instrumental in inflicting those sufferings. Leighton was restored to his liberty after nearly ten years' captivity in the Fleet, and a sum of £6,000 was voted to him in compensation for the hardships he had undergone.

Then followed the punishment of ecclesiastical offenders. The first to suffer was John Cosin, whose 'Collection of Private Devotions' had caused so much offence thirteen years before. Cosin had greatly added to this offence by his subsequent acts. In 1628 he had taken a leading part in 'the reparation and beautifying' of Durham Cathedral, of which he was a Prebendary. He had been vehemently preached against by another Prebendary named Peter Smart, who had described him as 'our young Apollo who repaireth the Quire, and sets it out gayly with strange Babylonish ornaments,' for which flight of eloquence Mr. Smart had lost his prebendal stall. Cosin had added to his misdemeanours by introducing the Laudian type of service into the college chapel of Peterhouse, Cambridge, of which he was Master. 'A glorious new altar,' writes Prynne, 'was set up and mounted on steps, to which the master, fellows, and schollers bowed, and were enjoyned to bow by Dr. Cosins, the master, who set it up.' Cosin was now Dean of Peterborough and a royal

chaplain, and he would not be the less obnoxious to the Parliament on that account. So Smart had now an opportunity of retaliating. He presented a petition against Cosin on the ground of his 'superstitious and Popish innovations in the church of Durham,' and of the part he had taken in the 'severe prosecution' of the petitioner himself in the High Commission Court; and Cosin was sentenced by the whole House to be sequestered from all his ecclesiastical benefices, and thus became 'the first victim of the Puritanical vengeance who suffered by a vote of the House of Commons' (Surtees, 'History of Durham').

The first episcopal victim was Matthew Wren, Bishop of Ely, who was accused (apparently with some truth) of exercising great severity when he was Bishop of Norwich. He had to give bail for his appearance, and was afterwards declared by the Commons to be unfit for any ecclesiastical preferment; and Lords and Commons joined in petitioning the King to remove him from his person and service. He was then imprisoned, and on his release he retired to his episcopal house at Downham, in the Isle of Ely. He did not remain there long, for he was again committed to the Tower, and, without even being brought to trial or admitted to bail, was kept a prisoner for no less than eighteen years.

Of course, 'the head and front of the offence' was Archbishop Laud, but he was too important a personage to be dealt with summarily; so, although he was the very first who was attacked in the Commons, some years elapsed before the full punishment came. Within a week of the opening of the Long Parliament, Sir Edward Dering, a quasi-

Churchman, commenced the attack: 'From every point,' he said, 'our lines of sorrow do lead unto him and point at him as the centre from which our miseries in this Church and many of them in the Commonwealth do flow.' The new canons, of which Laud was avowedly the framer, were discussed, and it was agreed, *nemine contradicente*, that 'as the clergy have no power to make canons without the consent of Parliament, those of 1640 are not binding either on clergy or laity, and that the benevolences granted are contrary to the laws, and ought not to bind the clergy.'

In all this they, of course, aimed at Laud, but it was not very strong ground to take up; for, in the first place, the Crown lawyers had, as we have seen, pronounced that Convocation was not dissolved with Parliament. And if it might sit, surely it might do business; for it could never have been intended to degrade an ancient constitutional assembly into a mere debating society. In the second place, the prolongation of the sittings of Convocation had not been Laud's doing, but the King's. Laud declares expressly that he had protested against it, and there is not the slightest reason to doubt his word; but the framing of drastic canons in such an assembly was a bold measure. 'Convocation,' writes Lord Clarendon, 'which is the regular and legal assembly of the clergy, was, after the determination of Parliament, continued by a new writ under the proper title of a synod, made canons, which it thought it might do, and gave subsidies out of Parliament, and enjoined oaths, which it might not do; in a word, did things which in the best of times might have been questioned, and therefore were sure to be con-

demned in the worst.' If so warm a friend of the Church as Clarendon disapproved of Laud's action, it was not likely that it would be approved by a hostile House of Commons.

Meanwhile Laud was being attacked in the House of Lords, the Scotch Commissioners giving the peers a terrible account of his doings in Scotland. Then a conference took place between the two Houses, and it was agreed that Laud should be impeached by the Commons before the Lords. Sir Harbottle Grimstone, in a violent speech, said that the Archbishop was 'the very sty of all that pestilential filth that had infested the Government.' 'There is scarce any grievance,' he added, 'or complaint comes before the House where he is not mentioned, like an angry wasp leaving his sting in the bottom of everything.' The motion, of course, passed, and Mr. Denzil Holles was sent to the bar of the House of Lords to impeach Laud 'as guilty of high treason in the name of all the Commons of England,' and to desire that his person might be sequestered. Fourteen articles of impeachment were brought against him; his treason consisted in his 'having attempted to alter the religion and fundamental laws of the land.' It was a vague charge, but it was sufficient. He was given into the custody of Black Rod, and on March 1, 1641-2, was committed to the Tower. There we must leave him for the present, for more than three years elapsed before his real trial came on, and meanwhile events were moving rapidly in England.

The great centre of opposition to Church and King was London itself, which had, of course, been brought into closer contact with the many unpopular

measures of Charles and Laud than any other place. So among the many petitions which poured into the House of Commons, one of the earliest, the most gigantic, and the most revolutionary, was from the Metropolis itself. In the late autumn of 1640 Alderman Pennington (at one time Lord Mayor) presented this petition, which was aimed point-blank, without any disguise, against the government of the Church by bishops, and against all Church ceremonial. It was in London, again, and its immediate neighbourhood that the first riots against the Laudian ritual and ornaments took place. The mob tore down the Communion-rails in the beautiful church of S. Saviour's, Southwark, and showed so dangerous a tendency to take the law into its own hands that both Houses, having passed a severe sentence against the rioters, ordered (January 16, 1640-1) that 'Divine service should be performed as it was approved by Acts of Parliament,' and that 'all such as disturbed that wholesome order should be severely punished by law.' This order was to be read in all the parish churches of London, Westminster, and Southwark.

The feeling, however, which was predominant in London was by no means universal. Counter-petitions flowed in in great numbers, which showed that there was still a strong Church feeling in the country. This was also shown by the summary rejection of the Root and Branch Bill, which was introduced into the Commons by Sir Edward Dering on May 27, 1641. Its object was utterly to eradicate 'bishops, deans, and chapters, with all chancellors, officials, and all officers and other persons belonging to either of them'—in fact, to destroy the whole

hierarchy of the Church. But this was far outrunning public opinion. The Bill was thrown out in the Commons, although only a few days previously that body had resolved 'that this House doth approve of the affection of their brethren in Scotland in their desire of a conformity in the Church government between the two nations.' In the Lords it would, of course, have had no chance; in fact, it seems to have been framed in consequence of the exasperation caused by the previous rejection in the Lords of a far milder Bill, which only proposed to take away the bishops' votes in Parliament.

Meanwhile, however, Parliament had set on foot a scheme which swept away one part of the Church system as understood by Laud. On January 23, 1640-1, the House of Commons issued an order that 'commissioners be sent into the several counties to demolish and remove out of churches and chapels all images, altars and tables turned altar-wise, crucifixes, superstitious pictures, and other monuments and relics of idolatry, agreeably to the Injunctions of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth.' The order may have been carried out more sweepingly than was intended, but it gave the sanction of authority to that wanton destruction which completed the handiwork of Thomas Cromwell and other 'reformers' in the days of Henry VIII. and his son.

The results may still be seen in the vacant niches, the few scattered remnants of old stained glass, the defacement of tombs and other monuments, the spaces from which brasses have evidently been removed, and other tokens of abominable sacrilege which fill the minds of pious Churchmen, when they

inspect these ancient edifices, with righteous indignation.

In March, 1641, a Committee of Religion was named in the House of Lords, consisting of ten bishops, ten earls, and ten barons, who were to consider the objections raised by the Presbyterians (then the dominant party, but soon to be superseded) against the Book of Common Prayer, and the doctrine and discipline of the Church generally. The chairman of this committee was Bishop Williams, who in the turn of the tide achieved a short-lived popularity. To his credit be it recorded, he declined to be made a cat's-paw[1] in the impeachment of his old enemy, Laud; but, true to his principles, he was anxious to make a compromise. Aided by the vast learning of Archbishop Ussher, he devised a scheme of Church reform by which the episcopate was to be retained, but with very limited powers. Like most persons who try to please both parties, he pleased neither. Of course, the High Churchmen could not for a moment accept him in the rôle which he seems to have assumed as pilot of the good ship, the Church of England, in place of the imprisoned Laud; and he did not go nearly far enough to please the anti-Laudians. How far short his scheme fell of what the latter contemplated may be judged by the fact that on June 15, 1641, a resolution to deal summarily with deans and chapters, and to apply their emoluments 'to the advancement of piety and learning,' was passed in the Commons and embodied in a Bill. Williams' scheme was promptly rejected, and when he accepted, on the nomination of the

[1] Perry, p. 442.

King, the archbishopric of York in October, 1641, he lost all his popularity. He was insulted by the mob in November as he went to Parliament, and before the end of the year was committed to the Tower. That his attempt to introduce his Bill for the limitation of episcopacy failed is no matter of regret. If it had succeeded, it never could have been more than a temporary compromise. When men differ on first principles, it is better to recognise the difference, and to live together in as charitable and Christian a spirit as may be under the circumstances; but this was not the philosophy of the seventeenth century.

Instead of helping Bishop Williams to bring about an impossible reconciliation, Archbishop Ussher was better employed in helping another prelate, Bishop Hall, in what is called the Smectymnian Controversy. Hall published a short tract, entitled 'An Humble Remonstrance for the Liturgy and Episcopacy addressed to the High Court of Parliament,' following a much longer work, entitled 'The Divine Right of Episcopacy.' Both were answered by five writers, Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcome, and William Spurstow, the initials of whose Christian names and surnames make up the strange word 'Smectymnuus.' Hall, having these five antagonists on his hands, appealed to Ussher to bring his store of erudition to bear upon the foe. Ussher responded to the appeal, and published a work entitled 'The Original of Bishops and Metropolitans briefly laid down.' Among those who took part in the controversy was John Milton, who wrote no less than five treatises in defence of the Smectymnians.

While all this was going on, what had become of the poor *roi fainéant*, who, after all, was the temporal head both of Church and State, without whose consent no new law could be passed, no constitutional change legally made ?

Deprived of his director in ecclesiastical matters, Charles seemed to some extent inclined to bow his head before the tempest. In July, 1641, he gave the royal assent to Bills for abolishing the Star Chamber and High Commission Courts, and the tender of the oath *ex officio* by any bishop or ecclesiastical person ; but this he could do with a clear conscience as a Churchman : for the Bills were not only inevitable, but highly desirable in the interests of the Church, which had incurred much odium and derived no real advantage from its connection with the two obnoxious courts, and with the arbitrary tendering of the oath. He then visited Scotland, and was persuaded in his bewilderment to assent to a Bill passed by the Scottish Parliament, which declared that the government of the Church by bishops was repugnant to the Word of God, and which led to the abolition of episcopacy in Scotland. But he afterwards bitterly repented of what he had done, and declared his willingness to do public penance for it.

On his return to England, the delicate task of filling up the vacant sees awaited him. The Puritans would gladly have seen them left vacant, and strong speeches were uttered in Parliament against the appointment of any new bishops. But, happily, this catastrophe, which would have been a step in the direction of cutting off England from Catholic Christendom (a danger which it had more than once narrowly escaped), was averted. The appointments

made were, by the admission of all, judicious ones.[1] The weakest, perhaps, was the translation of Bishop Williams to the archbishopric of York; but this was inevitable. Williams was, for the time, by far the most prominent ecclesiastic in England — out of prison; he could not have been passed over, and he might, at any rate, have been expected to be more acceptable to the Puritans (though the event proved that he was not so) than his predecessor, Archbishop Neile, Laud's early patron and lifelong friend. Williams was succeeded at Lincoln by Thomas Winniffe, Dean of S. Paul's, a most pious, gentle, and learned man, and a good Churchman withal, who had everybody's good word.[2] Joseph Hall was translated from Exeter to Norwich; and this, again, was an advancement which might have been expected to be acceptable to the dominant party; for though Hall, under the influence of Laud, had become a far stronger Churchman than he had been

[1] Even Francis Rous the elder, in his 'Speech in the House of Parliament, December 30, 1641, in opposition of the making Dr. Winniff, Dr. Holsworth, and Dr. King bishops (lately elected by his majesty) till a settled government in religion be established in this kingdom,' is careful to add that he has nothing to allege against the individuals. 'I speak not with an intent that you should cocneive that I reflect anyways upon the persons of any who may, perchance, be men of great learning and judgment.' And again: 'I desire, Mr. Speaker, not to be misconceived in this my speech concerning the stay of making those bishops yet unconsecrated. I speak not against their uncapableness or unworthiness of such places of government, but they are as able and fit for the same as any other.'

[2] Men of such various opinions as Anthony Wood, Daniel Neal, and Bishop Gauden agree in praising Bishop Winniffe, who is finely described as 'Ex eorum numero Episcoporum, quibus incumbebat nutantis Episcopatus molem, pietatis ac probitatis suæ fulcimine, sustentare.'

in earlier days, he could not have been so objectionable as his predecessor, Bishop Montagu, of 'Appello Cæsarem' notoriety; and Hall, like Winniffe, was universally respected. Hall's place at Exeter was filled by Ralph Brownrig, Master of S. Catherine's Hall, Cambridge, a man of great eminence, who afterwards showed himself a brave confessor for the Church; but he was not at all of the Laudian type, being a strict Calvinist; and if a new Bishop was to be appointed at all, no exception could be taken against the selection; in fact, the historian of the Puritans himself (Daniel Neal) owns that 'he was an excellent man, and of a peaceable and quiet disposition.' Brian Duppa, the King's old tutor and director, was translated from Chichester to Salisbury, and Henry King, Dean of Rochester, the amiable poet, took Duppa's place at Chichester. Dr. Skinner was translated from Bristol to Oxford, vacant by the death of Bancroft, and Bristol was given to Dr. Westfield, Archdeacon of St. Albans, who was well known as a popular preacher,—a high recommendation in Puritan eyes.[1] Dr. John Prideaux, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, was appointed to the bishopric of Worcester; and, finally, the see of Carlisle, vacant by the death of Dr. Barnabas Potter, was given *in commendam* to Archbishop Ussher, whose Irish see was in abeyance owing to the troubled state of Ireland. This last was a very wise selection, for Barnabas Potter was

[1] Bristol was first offered to Dr. Holdsworth, one of the King's chaplains, Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, President of Sion College, who is called 'a moderate Puritan,' but was also certainly a staunch Churchman; but Holdsworth refused the bishopric.

known as 'the Puritan Bishop,' and the appointment of a successor of the Laudian school must inevitably have led to commotion; but no reasonable man could possibly object to Ussher. He was by far the most learned man then living, and was, as we have seen, one of the authors of the abortive scheme for the limitation of the powers of the episcopate, while at the same time he was a fair Churchman.[1] But the fact is that all the appointments were more or less wise. If Charles had shown himself equally judicious in all the actions of his life as he did in this crisis, the troubles which befell the Church might never have occurred.

Nothing illustrates more forcibly the hold which the Church had taken at the very time when it seemed tottering to its downfall than the fact that men of so high a stamp could be found to fill its chief offices. It was a most dangerous elevation to which these good men were raised; it was perfectly well known by this time that the Church was doomed; they could not expect, and did not receive, any earthly reward; they were simply called to lead a forlorn hope, and every one of them was faithful to his charge all through the terrible crisis which was so near at hand.

Only two more bishops were appointed before the King's death. Dr. Accepted Frewen, Dean of Gloucester, and President of Magdalen College,

[1] An excellent and much-needed 'Life of Archbishop Ussher' has been published since the above was written. The writer, Dr. Carr, is a distinguished member and dignitary of that Irish Church of which Ussher was Primate. Those who desire to know more about Ussher would do well to read Dr. Carr's interesting volume.

Oxford, a stout Churchman, who had given offence by restoring his college chapel to decent order, was consecrated Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield in April, 1644, and in the August of the same year Dr. Thomas Howell, one of the King's chaplains, was consecrated Bishop of Bristol. The last may fairly be regarded as a martyr to the cause of Church and King, for on the surrender of Bristol to Fairfax, September 10, 1645, all the Royalist clergy were violently ejected; and the Bishop was so roughly handled that he never recovered from the effects, and died the following year.

The account of these episcopal appointments has carried us onwards a few years. We must now return to December 1, 1641, when the famous Remonstrance, or Bill of Indictment against the policy of the Government in Church and State, which had been carried in Parliament by a bare majority of nine, was presented to the King at Hampton Court. This Remonstrance shows that the very last thing which the Parliamentary party desired was religious liberty for all. Among the grievances complained of was 'the exempting Papists from penal laws so far as amounted to toleration.' The remonstrants have no wish 'to let loose the golden reins of discipline in the Church, and leave private persons or particular congregations to take up what form of service they please'; for 'we hold it,' they say, 'requisite that there should be throughout the realm a conformity to that order which the laws enjoin, according to the Word of God.' The evils against which they remonstrate are laid at the doors of the bishops, who are accused of 'triumphing in the excommunication and degradation of pious and learned ministers, and the

vexation and oppression of his Majesty's good subjects.' The King is desired to take away the bishops' votes in the House of Lords, 'to see that there may be a general synod of the most grave, pious, learned, and judicious divines of this island, assisted with some from foreign parts,' to 'purge the fountains of learning, the two Universities,' and to 'provide a competent maintenance for conscionable and preaching ministers throughout the kingdom,' and to keep down the Papists.

The Remonstrance was accompanied by a Petition, in which, after assurances of loyalty, the petitioners beg his Majesty 'to concur with his people in a parliamentary way,' (1) for depriving bishops of their votes in Parliament, and 'abridging their immoderate powers usurped over the clergy'; (2) for 'taking away such oppressions in religion, Church government and discipline as have been brought in or fomented by them'; (3) for 'uniting all such your loyal subjects as agree in fundamentals against Papists by removing oppression and unnecessary ceremonies.' All this meant, in plain words, that the Presbyterian platform should be exclusively established, as opposed to Episcopacy, whether Roman or Anglican, on the one hand, and to Independency on the other. The King's answer was dignified and moderate, but showed plainly that he remained firm in his attachment to the Church.

The outcry against the bishops' votes in Parliament grew louder and louder; mobs surrounded the House of Lords, shouting, 'No bishops!'; the temporal peers evidently wished the spiritual away, as inconvenient embarrassments; and so, on December 27, 1641, the bishops quitted the House, and met

in the lodging of Dr. Williams, Archbishop of York, by whose advice they signed a protest declaring all proceedings in Parliament during their enforced absence illegal.[1] This was undoubtedly good law, for the spiritual peers were a part of the Constitution; whether, in the excited state of men's feelings, it was also good judgment, is another question. At any rate, it hastened their downfall. The bishops who signed the protest were voted to the Tower; and on February 15, 1642-3, the Bishops' Exclusion Bill passed. The King, much, no doubt, against his will, gave the royal assent, and 'for twenty years the peerage of the bishops and the whole secular power of the clergy ceased.'[2]

All this time there lay in the same Tower another prelate, the most famous of them all, who seemed to have dropped out of notice. But on May 31, 1643, Laud's private letters and papers were seized, in the hope that something might be found in them which would incriminate him. His old enemy William Prynne was one of those to whom the order for their seizure was given, and Prynne was thus enabled to take a cruel vengeance upon his foe. For among the papers was found Laud's private 'Diary,' which it would have been unfair to publish in any form, for it was never intended for publication. But Prynne did worse than this: he published a garbled edition of the 'Diary'; and this publication has been freely quoted by Laud's enemies, as if the private, careless thoughts of a moment, meant for no eye but the writer's own, represented the deliberate convictions of a lifetime.[3] Whether the papers afforded any

[1] Perry, p. 450. [2] Neal, ii. 122.

[3] A 'true and faithful copy of the original' was published,

evidence we do not know, but on October 19, 1643, the Commons sent up to the Lords further articles against Laud, and on the 23rd the Lords directed him to send in his answer. On March 12, 1643-4, the trial began, and dragged its slow length along until the autumn. The law of treason was regulated by a statute of Edward III., and no single offence committed by Laud could be brought under that statute; but it was strangely argued that, though no single act was treasonable, the aggregate of them amounted to treason. The impeachment seemed about to fail, and the Commons changed their tactics. They dropped the impeachment, and proceeded by an ordinance of attainder. After much hesitation, the Lords agreed that the facts of the ordinance were true, and that Laud had tried to alter the established religion, and to subvert the rights of Parliament. The Commons then argued that Parliament had the right of declaring any crime it pleased to be treasonable; and to this monstrous assumption the Lords virtually agreed by passing the ordinance. On January 10, 1644-5, the aged Archbishop was beheaded on Tower Hill. His death, and that of his royal master four years later, contributed more than anything that either of them had ever said or done in his lifetime to deepen men's attachment to that Church which both sincerely loved, and to embitter

---

however, in 1695 by Henry Warton, chaplain to Archbishop Sancroft. Sancroft, into whose hands the papers of his predecessor (Sheldon) fell, had purposed publishing Laud's 'Diary' and 'History of his Troubles and Trials' himself, but was prevented by his many public avocations. Both will be found among Laud's Works, vol. iii., in the 'Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.'

them against her enemies, whom both sincerely hated.[1]

It is no part of the present work to dwell on the civil history of this eventful period. We may therefore pass over those two fatal steps of the King, his arrest of the five members and his flight from Whitehall, though both had at least an indirect bearing upon the history of the Church. But there was another civil act which so directly affected that history that it must be noticed. In spite of all the complaints of their misgovernment, the King's party were still very strong; and if it depended upon England alone, the Parliament could not carry their points. But might not Scotland, the sworn foe of Episcopacy, be persuaded to join in what, from one point of view, might be regarded as an anti-Episcopal crusade? The Scotch would only send aid to their friends over the Border on one condition; prelacy must be 'plucked up root and branch as a plant which God hath not planted.' Parliament was quite ready to meet their wishes in this respect. The Root and

[1] No less than three new Lives of Laud have been published since the above was first written, one (the best) by the Rev. W. H. Hutton (1895), one by the Rev. C. H. Simpkinson (1894), and one by 'a Romish Recusant' (1894); also a most admirable essay on Laud in Canon Bright's 'Waymarks in Church History'; and last, but not least, the 'Archbishop Laud Commemoration Lectures' (1895), edited by W. E. Collins, an interesting memorial volume containing the lectures delivered in the Church of All Hallows, Barking, at the 250th anniversary of Laud's decapitation. Of these lectures, the Bishop of Peterborough's (Dr. Creighton) and the editor's are especially noticeable. Having carefully read all this new literature on the subject, I have not found it necessary to alter in any material degree what I had previously written, but the reader will, of course, find a much fuller account of Laud in these works than is given in the text.

Branch Bill, which had failed before, now passed both Houses easily, the removal of the bishops' votes having obviated the difficulty it would have met with in the Upper House.

But this was not sufficient; it was, after all, only *de*structive, and required to be supplemented with something *con*structive; otherwise that greatest of all abominations, a toleration of differences in religious opinion, might be brought in by a side-wind. So in 1643 an ordinance was made 'for the calling of an assembly of learned and godly divines for settling the government of the Church of England, and bringing it nearer into agreement with the Church of Scotland and other reformed Churches abroad.' This assembly was to consist of 131 divines and thirty lay assessors, who were to meet in Henry VII.'s chapel, Westminster—hence its name, the Westminster Assembly. Several strong Churchmen, such as Robert Sanderson, Accepted Frewen, Henry Hammond, John Earle, John Hacket, John Prideaux, were nominated among the divines; but most of them declined to attend, feeling that they were in a hopeless minority, and would be placed in a false position. On July 1 sixty-nine divines assembled, but no serious business could be done until the appearance of the Scotch commissioners, who were the real masters of the situation; so, by way of killing the time, they employed themselves in revising the Thirty-nine Articles. At last the Scots appeared, and their demands were very simple. England must accept the Solemn League and Covenant as Scotland had done; there was no need to argue about the matter; that was the sole condition on which Scotch help could be

obtained. The House of Commons was quite prepared to swallow the dose, and so was the Westminster Assembly. On September 25 both subscribed to the Covenant, which was ordered to be read in all churches in London on the following Sunday—a monstrous piece of tyranny, considering that the Covenant directly traversed the whole system which those who had to read it were bound by their ordination vows to maintain. But even this was not all. The oath to observe the Solemn League and Covenant was to be taken by every person in England above the age of eighteen, on February 2, 1643-4; and this was the work of the very men who alleged the 'oath *ex officio*' and the '*et cetera*' oath among the chief of their grievances!

The imposition of the Covenant was one of the last of a series of measures which were essential to the object of the Parliamentary party. So long as the existing clergy remained in office, the work of 'purging' the Church must necessarily be hampered. Hence the task of getting rid of these hindrances practically commenced with the very first sitting of the Long Parliament. On November 6, 1640 (three days after the opening of Parliament), a Grand Committee of Religion, consisting of the whole House, was appointed. This was not a new thing; such a committee had been nominated at each session since the days of James I.; but it had never been so active as it now began to be. To this committee the many petitions against the clergy which have been already noticed were referred. But the work was so multiplied that it had soon to be divided among several sub-committees. These were at first generally called after the names of their chairmen,

but the most notorious of them were soon known by other names. In December, 1640, was appointed the Committee for Scandalous Ministers, to which the House gave formidable powers over the estates and preferments, and, what was worse still, over the credit and reputation, of the clergy. The committee specially invited informers to report to them any cases of scandalous ministers, which, of course, directly tended to stir up parishioners against their clergy. The definition of a scandalous minister included, not only one who was guilty of immorality or neglect of duty, but also one who adopted any of the obnoxious ceremonies. It was scandalous to bow at the sacred name of Jesus, to oblige communicants to come up to the altar-rails, to use 'Popish prayers,' under which designation came the Prayer for the Church militant. When a minister was convicted of being scandalous, the committee had power to sequestrate his preferment.

It may readily be conceived that such an inquisition would make great havoc among the ranks of the clergy, and soon create many vacancies. To fill up these vacancies, another committee was appointed, called the Committee for Plundered Ministers, The plundered ministers were those who had been ejected under the Laudian régime, and those who, being well-disposed to Parliament, had been ejected by the King's forces. The business of the committee was 'to consider of the fittest way for the relief of such godly and well-affected ministers as have been plundered, and likewise to consider what malignant persons have benefices here, in and about town, whose livings, being sequestered, these may supply their cures and receive their profits.' The

word 'malignant,' like 'scandalous,' had a technical meaning, being practically synonymous with 'Royalist.' The action of the committee brought home many Puritan clergy who had fled beyond seas, and many who had gone into retirement at home; and these were placed in the benefices vacated by malignants.

But the work of this committee was 'in and about town.' It had to be supplemented by that of the Country Committees, which were established in all parts of England, and were instructed to be 'speedy and effectual in the discharge of their office.' They were to call to their assistance some 'well-affected men' in each hundred, and inquire into 'the lives, doctrine, and conversation of all ministers and schoolmasters, the parishioners in general being not forward to complain of their ministers, though scandalous'—a remarkable, though quite unintentional, compliment, which illustrates what has been said above, viz., that the general feeling of the country was not so anti-Church as is sometimes supposed. They were to proceed against all ministers who were said to be 'scandalous in their lives or doctrine, non-resident, ignorant, idle, lazy, or ill-affected to the Parliament,' and accusers were 'encouraged to come forward by being free from all charges and fees.'[1] These country committees were not appointed until the early part of 1643, but, with so sweeping a commission, so many facilities for carrying it out, and such boundless powers,[2] they

[1] Walker's 'Sufferings of the Clergy' (abridged edition of 1863), p. 118.

[2] By what was called the Sequestrating Ordinance of March 31, 1643, they had the power of sequestering the estates

were able to do their work rapidly and effectually; so that, at the close of 1643, when the Covenant was enforced, there were far fewer 'scandalous and malignant ministers' who refused to take it than there would have been a year or two earlier.[1]

The net of the Covenant enclosed in its meshes many who had escaped from the nets of the various committees, and there were so many vacant pulpits that it was impossible to fill them at once 'with well-affected persons.' This was the opportunity for the many sects which were quite as obnoxious to the Presbyterians as to the Episcopalians. Sectaries of all sorts seized the vacant pulpits, from which it was extremely difficult to dislodge them. An utter Babel was the result, which lasted for nearly a year, when on September 16, 1644, the London ministers petitioned Parliament to urge the Westminster Assembly to expedite a scheme for ordinations, and

---

of notorious delinquents; and on August 16, 1643, this ordinance was supplemented by another, 'provided that in the number of these delinquents and papists mentioned in the first ordinance should be likewise deemed such as absented themselves from their usual place of abode, or betake themselves to the King's forces, and such as should embezzle or conceal any of their effects to avoid payment of taxes and assessments to the Parliament, or keep out of the way so as no tax could be levied upon them, or that concealed or harboured the goods or persons of delinquents, or should sue or molest any person for obeying or executing any of the Parliament ordinances or orders.'

[1] It is only fair to add that the commissioners were empowered to grant to the wives and children of delinquents a portion of the goods or estates sequestered, not exceeding one-fifth, for their maintenance; but this did not apply to the families of those ministers who were ejected for being scandalous, and it was not until 1647 that an order of Parliament rendered such grants anything more than optional.

to prepare a 'Directory for Public Worship.' The scheme was pressed all the more because scandal had arisen from the fact that some of the Westminster divines had seized several of the best of the vacant preferments for themselves, a course strongly reprobated by John Milton, among others, in his 'Character of the Assembly.'

The 'Directory for Public Worship' was ready in October, 1644; but as the Scotch were masters of the situation, and as, moreover, they were better acquainted than the English with Presbyterianism in its purity, it was on all accounts necessary to submit it to the approval of the General Assembly before its enforcement; so it was not enacted for use in England until January, 1644-5. The Parliament, however, could not allow another Christmas Day to be kept as a Christian Festival; so, anticipating the 'Directory,' it issued an ordinance on December 19, that December 25, 1644, was to be observed as a solemn fast-day. The 'Directory,' when it appeared, proved to be strictly after the Scotch pattern. No service was allowed at the burial of the dead; the observance of all holy-days was strictly forbidden; so was the use of the Book of Common Prayer; anyone found using that book, either publicly or privately, was to be fined £1 for the first offence, £10 for the second, and one year's imprisonment for the third; while any minister not using the 'Directory' was to be fined 40s. for each offence.

It seemed as if England had now gained what a large party in it had been aiming at for many years. Whatever else the 'Directory' did, it certainly swept away every trace of the Laudian Movement, and established just what the party had desired. But,

strange to say, when the happy consummation was arrived at, it was not acceptable. 'It proved,' writes Dr. Neal, who, at any rate, had no *Church* antipathies against it, 'not to the satisfaction of any one party of Christians.' To the Church of England it meant, of course, absolute proscription, and Churchmen did not tamely submit to be thus put down. Jeremy Taylor wrote 'An Apology for Authorized and Set Forms of Liturgy,' Henry Hammond 'A View of the New Directory,' and Robert Sanderson 'A Criticism of the Solemn League and Covenant'; and on November 13, 1645, the King took the bold step of issuing from Oxford a proclamation forbidding the use of the 'Directory,' and extolling the Book of Common Prayer. Of course, this was a mere *brutum fulmen*, so far as force was concerned; but its moral power was great, for the King had still many enthusiastic adherents who would be thankful to have their master's sanction for disobeying the powers that were.

The Westminster Assembly did not improve its position by its later achievements. The Lords were not satisfied with the temporary provision for ordination which the assembly had made, and ordered it to draw up a Directory for that purpose.[1] This was a particularly delicate task, for it touched the most crucial points on which the Presbyterians differed from the ancient Church of the land, on the one hand, and from the congeries of new sects on the other. There were representatives of all in the assembly, and such an attempt, of course, brought out strongly the antagonism between them. Neither were the Westminster divines particularly happy in

[1] Perry, p. 459.

the two Catechisms, the Longer and the Shorter, which they drew up. The Longer Catechism filled a volume of 157 pages, and even the Shorter Catechism filled 40, and dwelt upon the most abstruse points; so that both in its bulk and in its matter it was quite unfit for children, for whom it was intended.

It was not until the middle of the year 1646 that Presbyterianism was established as the national religion. In June of that year a scheme of Church government by presbyters and synods was sanctioned by the votes of both Houses of Parliament. Episcopacy was formally abolished, and the Church of England ceased to exist as a National Church. But the new scheme never throve; in fact, it was never carried out in its entirety, except in London and Lancashire; and even there its triumph was very short-lived, for in 1648 the army completely overruled the Parliament; and that army, under the command of Cromwell, brought in Independency, which was as much opposed to Presbyterianism as Episcopacy; so for the next twelve years the national religion, so far as there *was* a national religion, was Independency, or Congregationalism.

The Church, then, appeared to be lost; and yet, strange as it may sound, it is my deliberate conviction that she was in far less real danger when she was stripped of all outward support, when her clergy, and, for the matter of that, her laity too, were robbed of their incomes, when her liturgy was proscribed, and when the Legislation was passing law after law to her detriment, than she had been in the days of Elizabeth and James I., when she was being secretly undermined by men who passed as her sons, but were in reality not Churchmen at all.

At the same time, the sufferings of the Church during the twenty years between the opening of the Long Parliament and the Restoration were so severe that we may well pray that God in His mercy will never subject her to the like again. It is impossible to dwell on the innumerable cases of individual suffering. Those who desire to test the matter for themselves may be referred to Bishop Hall's 'Hard Measure,' and to Dr. William Cave's long and vivid account of the sufferings of his father, John Cave, the ejected Rector of Pickswell, communicated by him to Mr. Walker, and inserted at full length in Walker's 'Sufferings of the Clergy.'[1] These two are selected, not as exceptional cases, but as vouched for by two divines of very great eminence and of unimpeachable veracity. Joseph Hall and William Cave are names which carry weight; if anyone doubt *their* testimony, there is really nothing more to be said; and if they are correct, why should not the other accounts be correct also?

Next to the parochial clergy, the Universities required the chief attention of those who aimed at the destruction of the Church; for they were the nurseries of the Church to a far greater extent than they are now. We have seen how in the Remonstrance presented to the King at the close of 1641 his Majesty was desired, among other things, 'to purge the fountains of learning, the two Universities.' But the party which the Remonstrance represented had already begun the work of purgation themselves. On December 17, 1640, a committee had been appointed to inquire 'what the visitor or other had done at Emmanuel College, Cambridge,' which had

[1] In the modern edition, part ii., p. 220 *et seq.*

been founded as a Puritan college; and, soon after, to consider some grievances at Wadham College, Oxford. In 1642, when money and plate were conveyed from Cambridge to the King at the commencement of the Civil War, soldiers had been sent under Cromwell, who committed great ravages at that University. But these were merely preliminary skirmishes. The real struggle began when the ordinance for 'regulating the University of Cambridge' was passed in 1643. Of the country committees, none were so active as those under the Earl of Manchester in what were called 'the associated counties'—that is, the seven Eastern counties of Essex, Suffolk, Norfolk, Lincoln, Huntingdon, Cambridge, and Herts—and Cambridge became the centre of this association. The University was not now, as it had once been, the stronghold of Puritanism; it was the training-place of some of the most prominent Churchmen of this and a later day, and many of these were resident Fellows. John Cosin, Peter Gunning, Barnabas Oley, John Barwick, and his brother Peter, Isaac Barrow the elder,[1] Herbert Thorndike, Benjamin Laney, and many others who were in the forefront of the battle in their day, were Cambridge men. Cambridge therefore required to be purged, and it *was* purged most effectually. Twelve out of the sixteen heads of houses were ejected by the Earl of Manchester, and Fellows and scholars in the same proportion. In the congenial work of ravaging the college chapels, breaking the painted glass, smashing the organs, and tearing up the monuments, the committees had been

[1] His far more famous nephew of the same name was only an undergraduate when the Civil War broke out.

anticipated by the soldiers. The general result of the 'Regulation of Cambridge' is epigrammatically summed up by Dr. John Barwick in his 'Querula Cantabrigiensis.' It was 'to plant a new University for propagating at least, if not inventing, a new religion, and, seeing that they could not make the University of Cambridge rebel, to make at least a rebellious University at Cambridge.'

Oxford had to wait a little longer before the reformers could carry out their peculiar view of reformation there. It was the headquarters of the King, and was not surrendered to the Parliament until June 24, 1646. An ordinance for visiting the University was passed May 1, 1647. Sir N. Brent (the very same man who had been Archbishop Laud's Vicar-General!) and twenty-three other visitors were sent to make the most searching inquiries. The result was that by the middle of 1648 the commissioners had ejected about 600 members of the University, including ten professors and all the heads of houses except two. But the University utterly refused to submit to the visitation, and it was not till the close of the year 1649 that a complete purgation was effected.

But before that date was reached a change had taken place which upset the new fabric of Church government so laboriously reared. The second Civil War of 1648, consequent upon the unnatural alliance between the King and the Presbyterians, English and Scotch, issued in the triumph of the army, under Cromwell. Though the Long Parliament continued to exist for nearly six years longer, its power was virtually at an end; at any rate, it was powerless to maintain the Presbyterianism it had set up. For the extraordinary man who now

ruled the destinies of England had views of his own on religious matters; and they were the matters on which least of all he was likely to give way; for the religious influence which he had brought to bear upon the conflict was the real secret of his success. There was nothing on the Parliamentary side to balance the enthusiastic loyalty of the Cavaliers; patriotism was too vague and cold an abstraction to fire men's ardour in the same way that personal devotion to the Lord's anointed did. As early as 1643 Cromwell said to that true patriot, John Hampden, 'You must get men of a spirit that is likely to go on as far as gentlemen will go, or you will be beaten.' Cromwell was *then*, of course, only one officer out of many, but he tried the plan with conspicuous success in his own regiment, which he describes as 'a lovely company, no Anabaptists, but honest, sober Christians.' It was religious enthusiasm quite as much as valour and discipline which won the day at Marston Moor and at Naseby, at Dunbar and at Worcester. Every battle was an appeal to God; and every victory was a token of God's favour, rendering, through the confidence it inspired, the next victory more certain. 'Now let God arise, and let His enemies be scattered!' exclaimed Cromwell, as he grimly watched the Scots moving down the hill behind Dunbar to the narrow space at the foot, on which he knew he could attack them with advantage. Writing of the decisive victory of Naseby about a month after the battle, he says: 'When I saw the enemy draw up, and march in gallant order towards us, and we a company of poor, ignorant men to seek how to order our battle . . . I could not, riding alone about my business, but

smile out to God in praises, in assurance of victory, because God would by things that are not bring to naught the things that are.' His men thoroughly caught the spirit of their leader; in fact, he would have none but those who were sure to do so. He desired to have none but Independents in the army of the Eastern Association; and when he had found religious enthusiasts, he not only encouraged their enthusiasm, but let them fan it themselves, allowing his soldiers and their ministers the largest license of preaching and praying. When the victory had been finally won, was it likely—was it even fair to expect—that he would suffer these religious conquerors to be domineered over, and forced to bend their faith to the will of men who had not been able in the day of battle to show that the God of battles was on their side? Cromwell had never willingly submitted to the Presbyterian discipline. He had been forced to take the Covenant in order to qualify himself for military command, but he had done so with great reluctance. He had expressed himself with contempt about the assembly of divines, 'who,' he said, 'had persecuted honester men than themselves.' He had never any affection for the Scots, and his love of them was not increased by the part they had taken in the Civil War. Personally, he was inclined to be an Independent, and with Independents the Presbyterians agreed as little as they did with the Church. The religious element had assuredly no slight share in making the breach between Cromwell and the Parliament. He perpetually reminded that Parliament of the necessity of establishing the toleration promised in the vote of September, 1644; he appealed to the services which the Independents had rendered

to the great cause at Naseby and elsewhere. But the Parliament were not inclined to grant any general toleration; and the relations between the Presbyterians, who were at least as intolerant as the Church had ever been, and Cromwell, the tolerator of all sects, became strained. Matters, however, were promptly settled in the autumn of 1653 by the intervention of five or six files of musketeers, who 'took away those baubles'—the Speaker and the mace—and the whole of the Parliament with them. The Little or Barebones Parliament suited Cromwell better, being composed, as he naïvely declares, of 'men nominated by myself and my council of officers, persons fearing God, and of approved fidelity and honesty.'

On December 14, 1653, Cromwell was installed as Protector, and a scheme for Church government on the Independent platform was established. For a time it seemed as if the new régime would be more favourable to the Church than the old. Since 1644 the Solemn League and Covenant had been a hopeless barrier to the clergy; no clergyman could subscribe to it without a glaring violation of his ordination vows, though it is to be feared that some contrived to reconcile it to their consciences to do so. But Cromwell, who had never liked the Covenant, substituted for it a simple Engagement, by which all who desired to exercise their ministry had to swear that 'they would be true and faithful to the Government established without King and peers.' It was no violation of Church principles to submit to a Government *de facto* without admitting thereby that it was also a Government *de jure*. So sound a Churchman as Dr. Sanderson not only took the

Engagement himself, but wrote in favour of it. There was a difference of opinion among Churchmen, but it seems to me that, on the whole, the Church accepted the Engagement less unwillingly than the Presbyterians, who thought it a poor substitute for the Covenant, and a step in the direction of that 'accursed intolerable toleration'[1] of any views except their own. In fact, it really seemed for a while as if Cromwell might really form an alliance with the Church, as a set-off against the Presbyterians. He is said to have taken counsel with Dr. Brownrig, the deprived Bishop of Exeter; he certainly showed favour to the great Archbishop Ussher, whose chaplain, Dean Nicholas Bernard, he took for his own chaplain and almoner; he was a man of strong family affections, and it seemed possible that he might be influenced by his two daughters, who were both staunch Churchwomen. But such an alliance was impossible on both sides. On the one hand, the Church could never have forgotten the terrible tragedy of January 30, and who it was that was chiefly responsible for the murder of him who had certainly died a martyr in her cause. On the other hand, whatever else Cromwell was, he was not a Churchman. He had no sympathy whatever with the Church's system. When he was Governor of the Isle of Ely (1643), he suppressed the choral service at the cathedral as 'unedifying and offensive'; and now he showed the same spirit on a

[1] The expression occurs in a pamphlet by Daniel Cawdry, entitled 'Independence a Great Schism.' Thomas Edwards, author of the 'Gangræna,' uses still stronger expressions. See his 'Casting Down of the Last Stronghold of Satan, or a Treatise against Toleration and Pretended Liberty of Conscience.'

larger scale. The very toleration which he granted to almost all sects only emphasized his enmity to the Church. 'The liberty for tender consciences' had been the watchword of the Independents against the Presbyterians; this liberty the Protector granted to all, with two exceptions—Popery and Prelacy. Perhaps, as a matter of fact, more leniency was shown to individual clergy under Cromwell than under the Parliament, but legally the status of the clergy was far more intolerable.

In 1654 Cromwell appointed a central board of 'Triers,' who were to test the spiritual state of every candidate for a vacant benefice. He regarded this scheme with the utmost complacency, declaring that 'there hath not been such service to England since the Christian religion was perfect in England.' The Triers were not to exclude any from Cromwell's comprehensive Church who would come within the range of the 'three denominations,' as they were afterwards called. 'Of the three sorts of godly men,' he said, 'Presbyterians, Baptists, and Independents, though a man be of any of these three judgments, if he had the root of the matter in him he may be admitted.' But there is an ominous silence about the vast numbers who still clung to the Church of their baptism: were there no 'godly men' who 'had the root of the matter in them' among these? A check was at once put by this 'new Inquisition,' as it was rightly termed,[1] to a movement which was at this time made for bringing back some of the clergy to the exercise, under the strictest limitations, of their ministry. For the intention of the Triers was 'to get rid of the episcopal clergy who still retained their benefices,

[1] See Sadler's 'Inquisitio Anglicana.'

and to take care that no fresh episcopal clergy should come back to them.'[1]

But a still more stringent measure soon followed. Almost the only chance which the deprived clergy had of maintaining themselves and their families was by tuition. In this department there was a great opening for them; for a large proportion of the country gentry were Royalists and Churchmen at heart; and it was a common custom for them to employ some deprived clergyman as tutor to their families, while others of the clergy gained a precarious subsistence by keeping private schools. But a Royalist conspiracy in the West, which was speedily quashed, gave occasion for putting forth an edict (November 24, 1655) that, 'after the first of January next, no one might keep in their families as chaplains or schoolmasters for the education of their children any sequestered or ejected minister, and that none who were sequestered or ejected might keep any school, public or private, nor preach in any public place or private meeting of others but his own family, nor administer baptism or the Lord's Supper, or marry any persons, or use the Book of Common Prayer, etc.'[2] This was more than a proscription of the Church: it was an actual starvation of her ministers who remained faithful to their spiritual mother.

But, after all, the State was utterly powerless to crush the life out of the Church, which was never more vigorous than during these twenty years of apparently suspended animation. It could not even stop her in the exercise of common worship. All

[1] Walker's 'Sufferings of the Clergy,' p. 182.

[2] See Perry, p. 480.

sorts of means were devised for keeping up that essential feature of her life in spite of prohibitory laws. Some used the Church prayers from memory, making some slight variations in them so as to satisfy the letter of the law. Dr. Sanderson compiled a form, nearly but not quite identical with that of the Prayer-Book, which was used by many; Dr. Jeremy Taylor also drew up a substitute for the book 'for use under the present distress,' after a meeting of clergy at which it was agreed that, under the circumstances, the Prayer-Book might be dispensed with. Some boldly used the Prayer-Book, and defied the consequences. This was done by Dr. Hewett in S. Gregory's Church by S. Paul's, where Cromwell's own daughters were worshippers;[1] by Dr. Peter Gunning at the chapel of Exeter House in the Strand; by Drs. Fell, Dolben, and Allestree at Oxford. It is even said that 'three hundred Episcopalians used to meet at Oxford every Sunday, with the connivance of Dr. Owen, Dean of Christ Church.'[2] The system of lectureships, which, as we have seen, had long been a thorn in the sides of Churchmen, was now utilized by them. It was of the essence of the system that the lecturers should be independent of parochial organization. So now 'Hamlet and Laertes changed rapiers'; the parochial ministers advocated Puritan, the lecturers Church, principles, 'the door,' as it was quaintly said, 'being left so widely ajar that there

[1] In 1657 Dr. Hewett privately married Cromwell's daughter Mary to Lord Falconbridge. In the next year (June 8, 1658) Dr. Hewett was beheaded on Tower Hill 'for holding correspondence with Charles Stuart, for publishing him to be King of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and for sending him money.' See Neal, ii. 688.

[2] Hallam's 'Constitutional History,' ii. 314. note.

was room for Rutulian as well as Trojan to enter in.' Thus, Nathaniel Hardy 'maintained a loyal lecture' in London, at which monthly collections were made for the suffering clergy; Dr. Warmestry was lecturer at S. Margaret's, Westminster; Dr. Anthony Faringdon at S. Mary Magdalen's, Milk Street; Thomas Fuller at S. Bride's, Fleet Street, and, for a time, at other churches also; John Pearson at S. Clement's, Eastcheap—indeed, his immortal 'Exposition of the Creed' was really the substance of lectures given to the congregation of that church during the troubles.[1] Perhaps it was under the cloak of a lectureship that Jeremy Taylor preached as a Churchman to Churchmen in 1654, though he afterwards ministered in a private house.

It is fair to the authorities to state that they connived at many *country* clergy still holding their livings, in which they taught Church doctrines. Thus Lewis Atterbury, father of the famous Bishop, held the living of Milton; Edmund Pocock, the great Orientalist, that of Childrey;[2] Edward Stillingfleet, that of Sutton; George Bull, that of Suddington; Robert Sanderson, by a sort of exchange of prisoners,[3] that of Boothby Pagnell.

Among the many clergy who officiated as chaplains in private families, the most notable were Jeremy Taylor, who, to use his own stately language, 'in the

[1] See the beautiful 'Dedication' to 'his parishioners at S. Clement's, Eastcheap,' prefixed to many editions of the 'Exposition.'

[2] Pocock was all but ejected from Childrey for 'insufficiency' by Cromwell's Triers, but Cromwell had the sense to see the absurdity of pronouncing one of the first scholars in Europe, who was also leading a most blameless, useful life, 'insufficient.'

[3] See Izaak Walton's 'Life of Bishop Sanderson.'

great storm which dashed the vessel of the Church in pieces, was cast on the coast of Wales, and in a little boat thought to have enjoyed the rest and quietness which in England he could not hope for'— that is, in plain prose, was chaplain in the family of Lord Carbery, at Golden Grove, in South Wales Bishop Juxon, who was chaplain at Chastellon House, the residence of a family named Jones[1]; Bishop Morton, in the household of Sir Christopher Yelverton, at Easton Mauduit; Dr. Henry Hammond, in that of Sir John Pakington, at Westwood.

We have numerous instances of the confidence with which Churchmen looked forward to the restoration of the Church to its old position. When some were lamenting to Dr. Hacket the downfall of the Church, 'the good doctor advised them better, that the Church of England was still in being, and not destroyed, rather refined by her sufferings,' and he himself was 'full of faith that he should still live to see a better world one day.'[2] A number of anonymous Churchmen kept Salisbury Cathedral in repair, feeling sure that it would some day be required for its old purposes.[3] When Bishop Ralph Brownrig privately collated Dr. Seth Ward to the precentorship of Exeter Cathedral, and thereby incurred the ridicule of many, he was 'in full confidence that the King would be restored, and the precentor confirmed in his office.'[4] When Bishop Skinner ordained Bull

[1] See Dr. Hook's 'Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury,' William Juxon, vol. xi., ch. xxxix., p. 419.

[2] Plume's 'Life of Bishop Hacket.'

[3] See Pope's 'Life of Bishop Seth Ward,' pp. 62, 63.

[4] 'Some Particulars of the Life, etc., of Seth Ward, Bishop of Sarum.'

in 1655, he would not give him letters of orders, but 'withal assured him that when the ancient Apostolical government of the Church should be restored, which he did not question but a little time would bring about, they should be sent him.'[1]

This last incident leads us to a point of vital importance. If bishops were not allowed to perform their office of ordaining, how was the succession to the ministry kept up? Break the chain, and the continuity of the Church is interrupted. But, at imminent hazard, some of the deprived bishops bravely persisted in ordaining fresh clergy, and, in fact, many of the most eminent clergy of the next generation were privately ordained during 'the troubles.' Thus Simon Patrick was ordained at this period by Bishop Hall, Thomas Tenison by Bishop Duppa, Edward Stillingfleet by Bishop Brownrig. None of the deprived bishops was more indefatigable in this most essential part of episcopal work than Bishop Skinner of Oxford. The little village of Launton, between Oxford and Bicester, was the scene of his ordinations. Attended by Dr. Ralph Bathurst as his Archdeacon, or by Dr. Thomas Lamplugh, who is said to have made 300 journeys from Oxford to Launton 'on ordination business,' he secretly went out thither and ordained many. Thomas Morton, also, the aged Bishop of Durham, in spite of his advanced years, had the courage to hold secret ordinations at Easton Mauduit. Care was also taken to supply fitting candidates for the ministry. Largely through the efforts of Henry Hammond, who in this, as in many other respects,

[1] Nelson's 'Life of Bishop Bull,' p. 40.

was quite the foremost clergyman of the period, money was raised among good Churchmen for the education of young men of sound principles at the Universities, so that, when the time came, there might not be 'lacking fit persons to serve in the sacred ministry of Christ's Church.' Happily, there were still opportunities of indoctrinating the young with such principles from their boyhood; for it is a remarkable fact that the stern prohibition of tuitional work for the clergy did not touch the most famous school of all. Dr. Richard Busby, a staunch Churchman and Royalist, was allowed to rule Westminster with wonderful success, and, if tradition be true, with great severity, all through the period. A large proportion of the great Caroline divines, as well as the leading statesmen of the next generation, passed through Dr. Busby's hands during these twenty years; and thus the Doctor must be credited with a large share in the training of the Church of the future.

Some of the silenced clergy employed their enforced leisure in laying up stores of theological knowledge, which then or afterwards bore fruit in works which are the glory of the Church of England. Jeremy Taylor, Isaac Barrow, John Pearson, Robert South, Henry Hammond, Herbert Thorndike, John Cosin, William Beveridge, William Cave, Peter Gunning, Edmund Pocock, Brian Walton, George Bull, Robert Sanderson—in fact, most of the Church luminaries of the seventeenth century—either wrote or prepared for writing during this period. Never, either before or since, has there been such a galaxy in the firmament of the Church.

Of course, however, those who have the talents to

employ their leisure to any purpose in such a way must always be a very small minority; they were enough to preserve the vitality of the Church, but they were not enough to prevent its restoration to anything like effectiveness from being a most arduous and lengthy task, as the next chapter will abundantly show.

## CHAPTER V.

### THE STUART PERIOD.

*The Church in the Reign of Charles II.* (1660-1685).

Reaction against Puritanism—Apparent strength of Presbyterians—The Savoy Conference—New Parliament—Convocation revised Prayer-Book—The Clarendonian Code—Corporation Act—Act of Uniformity—Declaration of Indulgence—First Conventicle Act—Five-Mile Act—Evil effects upon the Church—Herculean task which the Church had to do—Prelates of the period—William Juxon—Gilbert Sheldon—John Cosin—Peter Gunning—Robert Sanderson—Other prelates—Great divines and good parish priests—Conduct of clergy during the Plague of London—Attitude of Church towards science, especially in regard to the Royal Society—The clergy and the persecution (1) of Nonconformists, (2) of Roman Catholics—Test Act—Exclusion Bill—Doctrine of Divine right—Titus Oates and Bedloe—Rye House Plot—Restoration of cathedral and parish churches—The Religious Societies—Death of Sheldon, and appointment of Sancroft to the primacy—Thomas Ken made Bishop—Spiritual and political types of Churchmanship.

THE restoration of the monarchy involved the restoration of the Church as a matter of course, and the nation at large was as ready to welcome the latter as the former; for it was at least as weary of religious as of civil anarchy. When the strong hand of Cromwell was removed, the strange ecclesiastical fabric which he had raised fell to pieces at once. The wild fanaticism of the various sects which

flourished in rank luxuriance, the sour Puritanism which had deprived 'Merry England' of all its recreations and made it merry no longer, the general belief[1] that this austerity was really no better than abominable hypocrisy, the unloveliness of the modes of worship, of the appearance, the dress, the tone of voice, and the phraseology of the Puritans, had rendered the whole system odious, and produced a recoil, from which the nation did not recover for several generations. Popery was scarcely more hated after the death of Mary than was Puritanism after the death of Cromwell.

The Church, like the monarchy, won all along the line; and it would have been a graceful and, for reasons that will appear presently, a wise act if she had thrown the weight of her immense influence into the scale of mercy towards her fallen foe. At the same time, the question was a far more complicated one than might at first sight appear. The obvious plan of granting toleration to those who could not conscientiously embrace the Church's faith, with a fair compensation to those who had been thrust into Church preferments when they were avowedly not Churchmen, would not at all have met the case. For the majority of malcontents were what is vaguely termed 'Presbyterians,' and these would not for a moment have thought of accepting a bare toleration, even if it had been accompanied with a generous compensation. No doubt, during the strong rule of Cromwell, the Independents had been the dominant party, while a vast number of sects had flourished under his protection; but when the

[1] Too general. There were very honest men, and, indeed, men of saintly lives, among the Puritans.

strong hand was removed, the Presbyterians again asserted their superiority. An idea of the proportions of the two parties may be gathered from the fact that in an address from the London ministers to the King after Venner's insurrection in 1661 appear the names of fifty Presbyterians who held parochial benefices in the Metropolis, and those of only eleven Independents in a similar position. In the country the Presbyterian majority was not so great, but still there *was* a majority. Moreover, it was through the Presbyterians that the restoration of the King had been effected, and the Convention Parliament which had recalled him was largely composed of that class. Some of these Presbyterians were quite ready to acquiesce in a 'moderate episcopacy' after Archbishop Ussher's model—that is, in an episcopacy in which the Bishop was only *primus inter pares* among his presbyters; others still insisted on the Scotch plan in its entirety; but one and all would have been contented with nothing less than a full recognition of their status in the National Church. In other words, they were, till an amicable arrangement could be made, Nonconformists in the proper sense of the term, not Dissenters. They were as strongly in favour of a National Church, with no toleration of any religionists outside it, as any Episcopalian could be. And they were so conscious of their apparent strength that they were rather inclined to tyrannize over the King they were bringing back. The commissioners who were deputed to meet him at the Hague were accompanied by eight or ten ministers, who told him that 'the people were disused to the Book of Common Prayer, and that it would be much wondered at if, as soon

as he landed, he should introduce it into his own chapel.' Charles replied very properly that, 'whilst they sought liberty, he desired to enjoy the same himself,' and professed a strong attachment to the liturgy. They then besought him not to have the surplice worn, but he was inexorable. We may take leave to doubt the sincerity of Charles's attachment to the liturgy, but we may well believe that he preferred it to the extempore effusions of the Presbyterians; for among his many failings, a want of culture and taste cannot be reckoned. He did not love the Church, but he positively loathed the Kirk: for he could never forget the humiliation to which he had been subjected by it; how he had been preached at and prayed at when he was at the mercy of the Scots; how he had been rebuked for the gaieties which he had allowed at his meagre Court in Scotland; how he had been forced, on pain of being cast off, to sign a declaration acknowledging his father's blood-guiltiness and his mother's idolatry; how he had had to swear to the Solemn League and Covenant when he was crowned at Scone in 1651. In fact, he had been so worried that he told Lauderdale that 'Presbytery was not a religion for a gentleman'; and when he escaped from the thraldom to France in 1653, he refused point-blank to attend the Presbyterian services at Charenton.

Nothing shows more clearly how strong the Presbyterians were, or were supposed to be, in England at the time of the Restoration, than the fact that the new King, in spite of his dislike to their system, was obliged to pay deference to them. At the instance of the presbyterian Earl of Manchester, he made some of their most distinguished divines, in-

cluding Baxter, Reynolds, Spurstow, Bates, Manton, and Calamy, royal chaplains. By the advice of Lord Clarendon, a meeting was held at Worcester House, Clarendon's residence, in the Strand, at which the King and some of his nobles were present, and six bishops on the one side, and six Presbyterian divines on the other. The Presbyterians were by no means satisfied with the King's promise of 'liberty to tender consciences.' Baxter spoke against a petition presented by the Anabaptists and Independents for a toleration; and all the Presbyterians were against any sort of toleration of the Papists. The King repeated his famous Breda Declaration, and was ready to bestow handsome preferments on several Presbyterians. Bishoprics were offered to three of their representative men. Reynolds accepted the offer, and became Bishop of Norwich; Baxter declined absolutely; Calamy waited to see whether the Declaration would become law; and this was the course taken by others to whom minor preferments were offered. Nothing daunted by this somewhat doubtful welcome of his favours, Charles issued royal letters (November 9, 1660), requiring the University of Cambridge to confer the diploma of D.D. on three eminent Presbyterians—William Bates, Thomas Jacomb, and Robert Wilde—'the King being fully satisfied of their integrity and loyalty.' In fact, the party was thought to be so strong that it was deemed necessary to conciliate them in every way; and the Presbyterians themselves believed that they were in a position to dictate terms.

But all this soon proved to be an utter fallacy. Even in the Convention Parliament symptoms of declining influence on the part of the Presbyterians,

and of increasing boldness on the part of the Episcopalians, appeared. But in December, 1660, the Convention Parliament, which was not, of course, a constitutional assembly, was dissolved; and before a new Parliament was elected, an event occurred which turned the tide still more strongly in favour of the Church.

This was the breaking out on January 16, 1660-61, of Venner's insurrection. Venner and his friends really represented only a small party even of the Fifth Monarchy men; they did not involve any of the Independents or Anabaptists, still less any of the Presbyterians, in their designs. But Englishmen were not in the mood to draw fine distinctions; whatever they were now, the Presbyterians had not always been in favour of 'Church and King'; so this abortive attempt intensified men's attachment to that which was, and always had been, the Church party; and their prejudices were still further roused by the fact that the Oath of Allegiance was tendered to and refused by the Fifth Monarchy men and other sectaries. One result of it all was the prohibition of all meetings for worship except in parish churches and chapels; another, that for the first Parliament summoned by Charles himself, May 8, 1661, the vast majority of elections went in favour of the Church party, though London, true to its traditions, returned all Puritan members.

But before this, arrangements were made for holding one of those irregular assemblies like the Hampton Court Conference, to which I venture to think disproportionate importance has often been attached. The last clause of the King's Declaration at Worcester House promised that a commission

should be appointed to review the liturgy and make additional forms, the commission to consist of an equal number of Episcopalians and Presbyterians. In accordance with this promise, it was arranged to hold a conference at the Bishop of London's lodgings at the Savoy in the Strand, which is known as the *Savoy Conference*. The warrant for the conference, dated March 25, 1661, gave the commissioners authority 'to review the Prayer-Book, comparing it with ancient liturgies, and to make such alterations as should give satisfaction to tender consciences, and restore peace and unity to the Church.'

Twelve bishops with nine coadjutors were appointed to represent the Episcopalians, and twelve leading divines with nine coadjutors the Presbyterians. The very best men were chosen on each side, and it would be difficult to find in any period of Church history a more illustrious assemblage.[1]

The first meeting was not held until April 15, when Dr. Sheldon, Bishop of London,[2] made the

[1] The following is the list: Dr. A. Frewen (Archbishop of York), G. Sheldon (Bishop of London), J. Cosin (Durham), J. Warner (Rochester), H. King (Chichester), H. Henchman (Salisbury), G. Morley (Worcester), R. Sanderson (Lincoln), B. Laney (Peterborough), B. Walton (Chester), R. Sterne (Carlisle), J. Gauden (Exeter), E. Reynolds (Norwich), A. Tuckney, J. Conant, W. Spurstow, J. Wallis, T. Manton, E. Calamy, R. Baxter, A. Jackson, T. Case, S. Clarke, M. Newcomen. The coadjutors were: J. Earle (Dean of Westminster), P. Heylin, J. Hacket, J. Barwick, P. Gunning, J. Pierson, T. Pierce, A. Sparrow, H. Thorndike, T. Horton, T. Jacomb, W. Bates, J. Rawlinson, W. Cooper, J. Lightfoot, J. Collins, B. Woodbridge, R. Drake.

[2] The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Juxon) was too old and infirm, and as the meeting was held in the province of

startling announcement that, as the bishops had no wish for any alterations at all in the liturgy, the Presbyterians must put down in writing what alterations they desired before any discussion could take place. A committee therefore was formed to tabulate objections, and Richard Baxter, the most prominent and active of the Presbyterian representatives, not only sent in a vast number of objections on his own account, but actually drew up a brand-new liturgy within the space of a fortnight. Surprise has been expressed at the activity which could effect such a task in so short a time, but there does not appear to me to have been anything very wonderful in the achievement. A vast amount of literary work —of a kind—may be done in a fortnight, and Baxter's liturgy is quite the kind of work that may be done *currente calamo*. It is of the florid order, and is full of metaphors taken from Holy Scripture. We are taught to pray that 'justice may run down as water, and righteousness as a mighty stream,' and to exclaim, 'Oh, habitation of justice and mountain of holiness!' In the directions about sermons, the preacher is enjoined to speak 'from faith and holy experience in himself,' 'with convincing evidence and persuading importunity'—excellent advice, but rather out of place in a rubric. The whole work was a work of supererogation; for the commissioners were only authorized to compose additional forms, not to supersede the whole of the old liturgy with a new one.

The mere fact that the leading representative of

---

Canterbury, the Bishop of London, as next in importance in that province, took his place.

the Puritans, having the old form before his eyes, with all its mellowed beauty, its dignified and chastened expressions, its wonderful assimilation of the spirit as well as the language of Holy Scripture, its hallowed associations with the past, stretching far away hundreds of years back, should really think himself competent to dash off in a few days a new composition to supersede the old, is of itself a sufficient justification of the bishops' conduct.

The objections sent in by the committee show the same utter recklessness about breaking with the past. To take a few suggestions out of many: The Litany was to be turned into one long prayer, which would make it differ from what had been understood by a litany for more than a thousand years; Lent was not to be observed at all, though it had been observed almost from the time of the Apostles by the Universal Church; saints' days were to be abolished, though the observance of such days had from the earliest times up to within the last hundred years been universal; the baptismal service was objected to for teaching baptismal regeneration, as it had been taught since the days of S. Peter; all the offices were to be reformed in which phrases occurred that presumed the congregation to be in a state of grace, as had been presumed in all the ancient liturgies quite as clearly as in the Anglican; the sign of the cross, the wearing of the surplice, the kneeling at the reception of the Sacred Elements, were declared to be unwarrantable; the liturgy was said to be 'defective in praise and thanksgiving'; the Catechism and Confession, imperfect; whenever the word 'priest' occurred, it was to be changed to 'minister,' and 'Sunday' to 'Lord's Day.' In short,

more drastic changes were suggested than had been demanded at the Hampton Court Conference. Some of these changes were fairly open to argument, but others would have gone far to cut off the worship of the Anglican Church from that of the ancient Catholic Church, from which she constantly reminds her worshippers in her formularies that she is not cut off.

The bishops intimate plainly enough in their replies that they felt this. There was nothing, they said, in the Prayer-Book that was contrary to the Word of God and the *practice of the primitive Church;* the observance of Lent and of saints' days had been the *universal practice of the Church;* the system of responses was consistent with the *practice of the early Christians;* S. Chrysostom in one of his homilies had shown the *high antiquity of the surplice;* kneeling was an *ancient and decent usage;* the *high antiquity of liturgies in the Church* was indisputable; to read the Communion Service at the Communion-table was an *ancient custom,* and '*let ancient customs prevail,*' unless reason demands their abolition, was the golden maxim of the Council of Nice.

Bishop Cosin suggested that the Nonconformists should state what they considered 'sinful' in the Prayer-Book, and what 'expedient to be altered.' Among things 'sinful' Baxter included many things which certainly had the sanction both of catholicity and of antiquity. How widely the two parties differed may be judged by the expressions used in the answer, drawn up by Baxter and apparently sanctioned by the rest, to the bishops' reply. The writer calls the Common Prayer 'a dose of opium, which is likely to cure the disease of divisions by

extinguishing life and uniting all in a dead religion.' 'Take all the world,' he says, 'for saints, and use them accordingly, and blot out the doctrine of reproof, excommunication and damnation from your Bible.' 'You are all,' he tells the bishops and their assessors—that is, some of the most learned divines that the most learned Church in Christendom has ever produced, 'unacquainted with the subject of which you speak.' 'The world will see that indeed we differ in greater things than ceremonies and forms of prayer.' 'All tends to take away the difference between the precious and the vile, between those that fear God and that fear Him not.' Was it possible that any concordat could be arrived at by any amount of discussion among men who differed so widely? It is not to be regretted that the conference came to an abrupt and rather ignominious conclusion, owing to the expiration of the time to which the commissioners had been limited —that is, four months, from March 25 to July 25.

Meanwhile the new Parliament had met (May 8, 1661). No one was to come into the House who did not receive the Holy Communion at S. Margaret's, Westminster—a most odious rule, which, like that of occasional conformity at a later day, tended to profane the Blessed Sacrament, and which became at once the cause of unseemly disputes. Dr. Gunning, the celebrant, refused the Elements to Prynne because he would not receive them kneeling; a Mr. Love pleaded an excuse that was not deemed satisfactory, and it was resolved 'that he should be suspended from sitting in this House until he should communicate, and bring a certificate from the commissioners to say that he had done so.' Some

excused themselves on the ground of sickness; others on other pretexts. There is something very revolting in the idea of thus forcing a man to receive the Holy Mysteries; but it was unfortunately only too true an indication of the policy which was to be pursued all through this Parliament.

Convocation met on the same day as Parliament, and set itself to that task of reviewing the Prayer-Book which was in vain attempted at the Savoy Conference. The alterations were not very important, but they were very numerous, and the reader must be referred to professed histories of the Prayer-Book for an account of them.[1] Some of them appear to have been framed to meet the difficulties of the Nonconformists, and indicate a conciliatory spirit on the part of the clergy which was certainly not shown by the laity assembled in Parliament. There is a special interest about this Convocation, because it was the last that had what may be termed a political existence; for the grant of a subsidy of four shillings in the pound, to be raised in four years, was the last instance of the clergy taxing themselves (1664). During the Commonwealth the clergy were taxed with the laity, and the adoption of this method after the Restoration was the solitary instance of the monarchy borrowing a leaf out of the policy of the usurpation. The change was effected by a private arrangement made between Clarendon and Sheldon, without any Act of Parliament. The same Convo-

[1] See Procter's 'History of the Book of Common Prayer,' part i., ch. v., pp. 108-144. A good summary will be found in Archdeacon Perry's 'Student's Church History,' second period, pp. 496-501, and in Bishop Short's 'History of the Church of England,' § 749.

cation continued to sit until 1666, and, among other things, it attempted to remodel the canons.

But the main interest, even as concerns the Church, is at this period centred in Parliament. From 1660 to 1667 the ascendancy of Lord Clarendon was predominant, and the ecclesiastical legislation has been termed the *Clarendonian Code*. Though it was all framed in favour of the Church, it cannot be said that the Church derived any real benefit from it. On the contrary, she incurred a vast amount of odium which, in common fairness, ought to have fallen upon the political rather than upon the ecclesiastical estate.

It was not thought necessary to make fresh laws to undo the work of the Long Parliament, because, as the Constitution required the royal assent before a Bill became law, laws made when there was no King were *ipso facto* null and void. It was contended, therefore, that the Church should come at once into the possession of those rights which had been unlawfully taken away from her; that the surviving bishops, nine in number, should be restored to their former sees, and new ones elected to fill the vacancies; that the surviving incumbents should take possession of their former benefices; that the liturgy should still be the only form allowed in parish churches, as it was before the Civil War; and that the Universities should be restored, as a matter of course, to their pristine state. Some maintained that bishops should also, as a matter of course, take their old places in the House of Lords; but, as this was a political matter, it was thought desirable to repeal formally the law of 1642, by which the bishops had been excluded from Parliament. It was also necessary

to pass an Act for the restoration of the ordinary jurisdiction of archbishops and bishops; for it could not be assumed that matters would go back to the state in which they were before the war, inasmuch as it had been decided, very wisely, not to revive the obnoxious High Commission Court; and it was through this court mainly that ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been exercised during the Laudian era. By a senseless and childish Act, but one very characteristic of the time, it was decreed that the Solemn League and Covenant should be burnt by the common hangman, and, what was more reasonable and, indeed, necessary, that all copies of it in churches and chapels, in London and the country alike, should be taken down.

There is nothing that can be fairly urged against most of these proceedings; but the same cannot be said of the *Corporation Bill*, which was read for the first time on June 19, 1661, and which was the first of those intolerant Acts which all true Churchmen must regret at least as much as any Nonconformist.[1] It required that all members of corporations should, besides taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, which would surely have been enough for all practical purposes, also swear that it is not lawful, under any pretence, to bear arms against the King—a very doubtful statement, and that the Solemn League and Covenant was unlawful—a very unnecessary one. But, worst of all, it enacted that no one should be eligible for office who had not, within one year

[1] The reason why this stringent Bill was the first that was introduced under Clarendon was doubtless because the cities and boroughs were strongholds of Presbyterianism. This fact may account for, but does not in the least justify, the measure.

before, 'taken the Sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England,' thus making the Holy Eucharist

> 'An office-key, a picklock to a place,'

and placing conscientious clergymen in the painful predicament of having to offer the highest privileges of religion to men who were known to desire them only to qualify themselves for a secular office. The Bill was not passed without much opposition.

Then followed the *Act of Uniformity*, which was introduced into the House of Commons by Serjeant Keeling, afterwards Chief-Justice, on June 29, 1661. It did not pass that session, and when it *did* leave the House of Commons it differed in some respects from what ultimately passed. The two previous Acts of Uniformity, viz., that of 2 Edward VI., which was repealed under Queen Mary, and that of 1 Elizabeth, had been content simply to enjoin the use of the Book of Common Prayer, and to enact penalties against the 'depravation' of it; but the present Act in its final form was more specific and more rigorous. It enacted that any beneficed clergyman should be ejected *ipso facto*, unless before August 24, 1662, he used the Church service and declared 'his unfeigned assent and consent to everything contained and prescribed in the Book of Common-Prayer'; and that every person holding ecclesiastical or academical preferment, or teaching publicly or privately, should before the same day subscribe a declaration 'that it is unlawful to take arms against the King upon any pretence whatsoever; that he will conform to the liturgy, and that no obligation from the Covenant lies upon himself

or any other person.' This last clause was to be in force only until 1682. The Act was to be enforced under pain of deprivation, or of fine and imprisonment in the case of an unendowed schoolmaster or tutor.

In estimating this Act, two entirely different questions, which are apt to be confounded, ought to be carefully distinguished. It is one thing to insist upon all the rules of a society being observed by all the officers of that society; quite another, to insist upon everybody belonging to that society on pain of being subjected to temporal penalties. So far as the Act of Uniformity insisted upon the former point, it was reasonable and right; so far as it insisted upon the latter, it was unreasonable and wrong. No society, much less a great National Church, can flourish when its own accredited ministers are unfaithful to its teachings. But the injustice comes in when ministers are practically debarred from leading the worship of God in their own way; and the result of the Act of Uniformity was that they must either become ministers of the Established Church or else cease from ministering altogether; and, as a necessary consequence, the congregations were left destitute of the means of worshipping God in what they considered, whether rightly or wrongly, the proper way. The details also of the measure were unjust. There was a refinement of cruelty in appointing August 24 ('Black Bartholomew's') as the day on which the ministers must either conform or be ejected; for, as the tithes were payable at Michaelmas, the date was ingeniously fixed to deprive them of their half-year's income. And no provision whatever, not even a poor fifth, was made for the compensation of men who, perhaps through no fault of

their own, had been placed in a false position, and who, having been trained for one kind of work, could not easily adapt themselves to, or even find, another. It is no answer to say that the majority of those who were ejected would, as has been already shown, never have been contented with a bare toleration, even if accompanied by a handsome compensation. Perhaps not. People are very often dissatisfied with the arrangements of their rulers, but they are obliged to submit; and if no injustice is done to them, we may bear with an equal mind their dissatisfaction. Nor is it any answer to say that the same measure was dealt to *them* as *they* dealt to others in the day of their triumph; for we have yet to learn that the *lex talionis*—an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth—is the law of Christianity.

The King did not mend matters, but quite the reverse, by issuing on December 26, 1662, a Declaration of Indulgence, in which he 'undertook, with the concurrence of Parliament, to exercise on behalf of religious dissidents the dispensing power which he conceived to be inherent in the Crown.' The Declaration never passed into law; the Nonconformists themselves did not receive it at all favourably; they thought, and probably with good reason, that the King's real object was to relieve the Roman Catholics. In fact, it is said that the only effect of the Declaration was to bring about a reaction, which led to the passing in 1664 of the third Act of the Clarendonian Code—the *First Conventicle Act*. By this Act, every person above the age of sixteen, who should be convicted before two magistrates of being present at a conventicle, was to be subjected to a penalty not exceeding £5, or imprisonment for three

months; for the second, £10, or six months; for the third, or any subsequent offence, upon conviction before a court of assize, to the payment of £100. A conventicle was defined to mean any house where five persons or more, beyond the inhabitants, assembled for the purpose of religious worship; and any conventicle might be prevented, or broken into.

The edifice was crowned by the passing in 1665 of the *Five-Mile Act*, which subjected any Nonconforming minister who should come, except in travelling, within five miles of any corporate town, or any other place where he had been minister, to a penalty of £40, or six months' imprisonment, unless he would take the oath not to bear arms against the King upon any pretence; and all persons not frequenting the Church of England, who ventured to teach a public or private school, incurred the same penalty. If it be true that the brave conduct of Presbyterian ministers in occupying vacant pulpits and administering the consolations of religion during the Plague of London led to the passing of this Act, it only makes matters worse. This was the last Act of the Clarendonian Code, for in 1667 Clarendon himself fell into disgrace, and the seven Acts of the same type which were passed in later years had no connection with him.

All these severities had the natural effect of driving men into the Church who were merely Conformists, not Churchmen. The Code acted like a sieve through which the worst men were passed, while the best were strained off. When the Earl of Manchester told the King, during the debate about the Act of Uniformity, that he was afraid the terms were so rigid that many of the ministers would not comply

with it, Sheldon, who was present, replied, 'I am afraid they will.' Those who did were not the best of their class, and they proved terrible thorns in the sides of the Church. 'Persons that had no great liking for the liturgy or ceremonies'—to use the naïve description of one who was almost a contemporary[1]—'or, indeed, the government of this Church, but yet had attained to such a largeness and freedom of judgment, as that they could conform, though without any warmth or affection for these things,' were surely better outside than inside the Church. South's sermons are full of scathing and racy invectives against such men. The writers of the Lives of Bishop Hacket and Bishop Frampton[2] make similar complaints; and Denis Granville, Dean of Durham, stigmatizes 'the nonconformity, or rather semi-conformity, of the clergy (who did with zeale more than enough and sometimes too bitterly inveigh against nonconformists), which engendered that brood which are the authors of our misery, and their forwardness to dispense throughout the nation with the Church discipline as they pleased.'[3]

The Church could ill afford to be weighted with such unfaithful officers; for she had a Herculean task to perform in cleansing an Augean stable, both in a literal and a metaphorical sense of the expression. In the literal sense, she had to bring into something like decency the fabrics of the cathedrals and parish churches, which, partly by neglect,

[1] John Beardmore, Tillotson's pupil at Clare Hall. See the Appendix to Birch's 'Life of Tillotson.'

[2] 'Life of Bishop Frampton,' edited by the Rev. T. Simpson, p. 133; and Plume's 'Life of Bishop Hacket.'

[3] 'Remains of Dean Granville,' Surtees Miscellanea, part i., p. 136.

partly by the wanton havoc of the Puritans, had fallen into a state of the utmost squalor and decay; in the metaphorical sense, she had to purify and re-edify the spiritual fabric, of which the outward buildings were only too apt an emblem. The very appliances for the administration of the Sacraments were utterly dilapidated; the fonts were broken and polluted; the chancels, and especially the sanctuaries, were often in utter ruin. And no wonder, when it was almost universal to baptize in private, and when in some parishes the celebration of the Holy Communion had fallen into entire disuse, and in many had been performed only at the rarest intervals.

Happily, there was an exceptionally strong set of bishops during the reign of Charles II. Most of them were earnest and consistent Churchmen, whose characters had been strengthened by the persecutions they had suffered 'during the troubles.' A few of these may be noticed.

*William Juxon* (1588-1664) succeeded to the primacy as a matter of course—the trusted friend of the martyr-King could not be passed over; but the weight of seventy-eight years and the troubles he had gone through disabled him from taking an active part in Church work during the three years when he was Archbishop of Canterbury. The Northern Primate, Dr. Accepted Frewen, was also beyond the allotted age of man when he went to York. The real 'primate,' or first man, was from the time of the King's restoration *Gilbert Sheldon* (1598-1677), who was appointed Bishop of London, and who succeeded Juxon at Canterbury in 1663. It was in some respects to the advantage, in others very much to the disadvantage, of the Church, that the guiding

spirit in it during those eventful years which followed the King's return was a man of the type of Sheldon. He was a statesman rather than a divine; but in the troubled waters through which the ark had then to pass, it was essential to have a statesman at the helm. He was a man of undaunted courage, moral and physical, a most munificent prelate, an encourager of learning in others, if not in the technical sense a learned man himself; it was to him more than to anyone else that the excellent Church appointments which were a marked characteristic of the Caroline period were due. But, on the other hand, he was somewhat deficient in spiritual-mindedness; in no man was the reaction against the supposed cant and hypocrisy of the Puritans more conspicuous. He was a bitter enemy of Nonconformity and Nonconformists, and not exactly the man to build up the spiritual edifice of the Church, his conception of which hardly seems to have gone beyond that of a national establishment. He is responsible for much of the odium which fell upon the Church during this period of its apparent triumph, but real difficulty. Though he was far and away the most influential Churchman of the day, there were men of a higher type of Christian character.

Among these a prominent place must be given to *John Cosin* (1595-1671), who was appointed at the Restoration Bishop of the great palatine see of Durham. Cosin in many respects resembled Sheldon; he was equally strong, equally courageous, equally munificent, and equally bitter against Nonconformity; but there was a more distinctly spiritual side to his character; he was essentially a divine as well as a statesman. In no part of the kingdom was

Church order more quickly and effectually restored, in no part did Church principles take a more deep and abiding root, than in Durham; and the main reason was that Bishop Cosin left the impress of his own strong character upon the diocese.

Another prelate who shed lustre upon the period was *Peter Gunning* (1613-1684), who, having been, like Cosin, conspicuous for his consistent and undisguised attachment to the Church during the troubles, was deservedly promoted, first to the bishopric of Chichester, then to that of Ely, after the Restoration. The spiritual element appears more markedly in Gunning than in either Cosin or Sheldon.[1] Like both of them, he was extraordinarily munificent, and a stern opponent of Nonconformity, though kind to individual Nonconformists.

But there was another prelate who, though he only survived the Restoration two years, achieved a higher reputation than any. This was *Robert Sanderson* (1587-1662), Bishop of Lincoln, about whose name there is a halo like that with which Thomas Ken's is invested. This is partly owing to his own merits, spiritual and intellectual—for he is equally remarkable as a saint and as a scholar—but partly also to the fact that the prince of biographers, Izaak Walton, took him for one of the subjects of his immortal 'Lives.' The most active part, however, of Sanderson's life belongs to an earlier period than that now before us. The same may be said

[1] Gunning seems to have been particularly effective as a director of souls. See 'Vita Joannes Barwick,' p. 237; John Evelyn's 'Diary' for March 29, 1672-73; also Evelyn's 'Life of Mrs. Godolphin' and Dean Denis Granville's 'Remains,' *passim*.

of two successive Bishops of Chester, Brian Walton, editor of the Polyglott Bible, and John Pearson, author of the 'Exposition of the Creed.' Both shed the lustre of great names upon the Bench; but neither took much active part in the general work of the Church after the Restoration. John Hacket, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry; John Dolben, Bishop of Rochester, and afterwards Archbishop of York; Seth Ward, Bishop successively of Exeter and of Salisbury; John Fell, Bishop of Oxford; and George Morley, Bishop first of Worcester and then of Winchester, were all very distinguished men in their way, but there were others of still greater mark who never attained episcopal rank.

Isaac Barrow, Robert South, John Barwick, Herbert Thorndike, Barnabas Oley, Edmund Pocock, Richard Allestree, with many others, form a band of Churchmen to which it would be difficult to find a parallel for abilities and attainments in any age since the Reformation. There were, again, in Charles II.'s reign some exemplary parish priests who carried out the work of the Church in their respective spheres with conspicuous success. In London, such men as William Beveridge at S. Peter's, Cornhill, Simon Patrick at S. Paul's, Covent Garden, John Sharp at S. Martin's-in-the-Fields; and in the country, men like Isaac Milles, first at Chipping Wycombe and then at High Clere, Thomas Ken at Easton and then at Brighstone, Richard Sherlock at Winwick, were making the Church a real, spiritual power, and effecting far more than all the Acts of Parliament which were passed in her favour, but which in reality only tended to prejudice men against her officers.

For injustice has certainly been done to the general body of the clergy at this period, an instance of which occurs in the year at which we had arrived before the digression that has just been made. The last Act of the Clarendonian Code was passed in a Parliament held at Oxford, not in London, because the Plague was then raging in the Metropolis. A contrast has sometimes been drawn between the conduct of the Anglican clergy and that of the ejected ministers during this terrible scourge. One of the ablest and fairest historians of the seventeenth century asserts that 'whilst the Anglican clergy fled, the Presbyterian preachers mounted once more the pulpits.'[1] That some fled, and that their places were filled not only in the pulpit, but at the bedside of the sick and dying, by the ejected ministers is true: all honour to those who thus rushed bravely into the breach! But we have the most direct evidence that the pusillanimity of the clergy was far from being universal. Archbishop Sheldon set an excellent example by staying at Lambeth all through the time of the greatest danger, and procuring aid for the sufferers. Simon Patrick remained manfully at his post at S. Paul's, Covent Garden, and endeared himself to his parishioners by so doing.[2] In the 'Ellis Correspondence' we have such entries as the following: 'The Prayers of the Church [S. Paul's] are continued, and persons attending.' 'On the last Holy-day we had a sermon, and shall have another on the Fast-day.' 'The Cross sermons are continued, and we had on the Fast-day a laudable sermon by Mr. Risden,

[1] 'History of England, principally in the Seventeenth Century,' by Leopold von Ranke, iii. 447.

[2] See his 'Autobiography,' p. 57.

minister in Bread Street.' 'Mr. Portington [one of the S. Paul's clergy] lies at the point of death, whose turn being to officiate this week, I supply.' The writer is a Mr. Bing, one of the clergy who stayed at his post, who also intimates that the flight of some of the London clergy was not allowed to pass with impunity. 'It is said that my Lord Bishop of London hath sent to those pastors that have quitted their flocks by reason of these times, that, if they return not speedily, others shall be put into their places.' Letters from Dr. Tillotson in the same Correspondence show that he remained in London during the Plague and rendered active aid to the sufferers. All the letters were written when the Plague was at its height, and in the very centre of the danger. The contempt with which Pepys writes of the flight of his own minister, Mr. Mills, seems to me to indicate that such conduct could not have been universal, or even very general. Finally, we have the unexceptionable testimony of Daniel Defoe, who would not be inclined to treat the clergy too favourably, and who, as living nearer the time, must have known better than later writers. 'It is true,' he says, 'some of the dissenting turned out ministers stayed, and their courage is to be commended and highly valued, but these were not in abundance; it cannot be said that they all stayed, and that none retired into the country, any more than it can be said of the Church clergy that they all went away; neither did all those that went away go without substituting curates and others to do the offices needful and visit the sick as far as it was practicable.'[1]

[1] 'History of the Great Plague,' p. 272.

Again, those who charge the clergy as a body with opposing the progress of science, especially in regard to the Royal Society, which was one of the few glories of this inglorious reign, are surely far too sweeping in their statements. It is true that some great clerical names may be found among the opponents of the society. Dr. South ridiculed it in that very character in which he ought to have been its panegyrist, namely, as Public Orator of the great University where the society had been nourished in its infancy; and Dr. Peter Gunning and others opposed it. But, on the other hand, Churchmen, both lay and clerical, were among its earliest supporters and brightest ornaments, as the names of both Matthew and Christopher Wren, John Wilkins, Seth Ward, Robert Boyle, Ralph Bathurst, Thomas Willis, John Pearson, Joseph Glanville, and others, sufficiently show. In fact, it was asserted by a contemporary that 'a great part of the discoveries of the society up to that time (1671) were owing to ecclesiastical persons.'[1]

There is another charge brought against the clergy of Charles II.'s reign, of which it is not so easy to acquit them. The severe laws against the Nonconformists were, if not actually instigated, at any rate not protested against by them. The *Second Conventicle Act* of 1670, though in some respects milder than the first, contained two provisions which offered a direct incentive to persecution. Informers were encouraged to pursue their invidious task by being allowed a share of the fines inflicted upon Nonconformists; 'prosecutors were to be saved harmless in

[1] See 'Life in the English Church' (1660-1714), p. 321.

any outrage they might commit;'[1] and Archbishop Sheldon pressed the clergy to see that the law was strictly carried out. We cannot complain of their disapproval of the King's Declarations of Indulgence, for these were at least very doubtful exercises of the royal prerogative. But one would have been glad to know that the clergy had done something to obtain by right means what the Declaration attempted by wrong; but, though many of the bishops were inclined to deal kindly with individual Dissenters, I cannot find any disposition during Sheldon's primacy, on the part of the Church as a body, to grant relief to Nonconformists as a body. It might safely have been done, for the danger to the Church from the side of Nonconformity was purely imaginary. The reaction against Puritanism was far too strong to allow it the faintest chance of again getting the upper hand.

There was more reason for alarm from the opposite quarter; and though nothing can justify the severe persecution which the Roman Catholics suffered, we can well understand how essential it was deemed to take precautions against a return to the evil days of Queen Mary. In the first place, when men are thoroughly disgusted with one extreme, there is always a fear of their rushing into the other. Again, it had, as has been already observed, been the tradition of the English to follow the religion of their sovereigns. The reigning monarch was more than half suspected of being a Romanist at heart; the heir-apparent was avowedly one, and his marriage, in 1673, with the Princess Mary of Modena added to the nation's alarm.

[1] Perry, p. 508.

In 1673 the *Test Act* was passed, by which no one was allowed to take any office, civil or military, under the Crown, unless he was a communicant in the English Church. The pretext for this Act was that this was the only criterion by which a Roman Catholic could be detected. The Pope could absolve a man from any other engagement, but the Holy Communion was too solemn a thing for one who believed in the doctrine of Transubstantiation to interfere with. The Act proved a two-edged sword, which might be used to smite Nonconformists quite as keenly as Roman Catholics, and the former soon found out their mistake in approving of the measure.

But even this Act did not suffice to allay the alarm of those who dreaded the succession of a Roman Catholic to the throne. Persistent efforts were made to pass an *Exclusion Bill*, by which the Duke of York was to be shut out from his inheritance to the crown of England. This, however, touched another point on which the English were as sensitive as they were on the dangers of Romanism. The doctrine of Divine, hereditary, indefeasible right had almost become an article of faith, though it can hardly be dated earlier than the reign of Charles I. James I., indeed, had contended vehemently for it, but had scarcely succeeded in persuading his subjects generally to accept it. In earlier times it had certainly been held sufficient if any one member of the Royal Family—the most competent—was crowned, and some who are now called usurpers were not so regarded by their contemporaries. But the Wars of the Roses had impressed upon men the expediency of a regular succession;

and then the death of the Royal Martyr had caused such an awful shock to men's minds that the doctrine of the Divine right of kings, and its corollary, that of passive obedience, had become points of religious belief. And so not even the fears of a Roman Catholic heir to the throne could induce a majority to interfere with the direct order of succession, and the Exclusion Bill, though frequently pressed, never passed. But, short of this, the English were prepared to go any lengths to keep down the Roman Catholics, and would listen to any improbable story against them. The panic reached its height in 1678, when Titus Oates, a disreputable clergyman, with his equally disreputable coadjutor, William Bedloe, invented the basest and most glaring falsehoods about the machinations of the Papists. The more credence he gained, the more audacious he became; and the mysterious and violent death of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, J.P. for Westminster, before whom Titus Oates made his first depositions on oath in support of his charges, roused the popular indignation against the Roman Catholics to fever-heat, though there was no evidence of any weight to implicate them in the murder. The abortive attempts to supplant the Duke of York by Monmouth, 'the Protestant Duke,' were indications of the same feeling; and so, in a different way, was the unexplained mystery of the Rye House Plot, which would probably never have gained credit had it not been thought that Protestants would have recourse to any desperate remedy against the danger of a Romish succession. But all these things may be lightly passed over as not being a substantive part of the history of the Church.

It is more to the purpose to notice the real work which was done by the Church. The amount spent on church-building and repairs must have been very large. Lichfield Cathedral was almost rebuilt through the exertions of Bishop Hacket; large sums were spent upon Exeter, Salisbury, and many other cathedrals, and upon parish churches throughout the land. It would be vain to attempt to enumerate details, but the reader may be referred to the two Lives of Sir Christopher Wren, which will show him how much was done by one single architect, who, of course, did not monopolize the whole work of the country.[1] Besides the havoc made by the Puritans in all parts of the land, there was a special necessity for church-building in London, owing to the destruction of no less than eighty-nine churches by the Great Fire of 1666; those built in their place were mostly on the plans of Wren, and Wren's churches were very costly.[2] The greatest work of all was, of course, the rebuilding of S. Paul's Cathedral, which commenced in Charles's reign, 1675, but was not all completed until 1710, though it was open for Divine service on December 2, 1697. When we look at such churches as S. Mary-le-Bow, or S. James's, Piccadilly, both built at this period, we can see at a glance that expense was not taken into account in their construction.

Turning from the material to the spiritual fabric, we may notice the origin of the *Religious Societies* in 1678, which are indicative of a spiritual earnestness

[1] 'Sir Christopher Wren and his Times,' by J. Elmes, 1852; 'Sir Christopher Wren: his Family and his Times,' by Lucy Phillimore, 1881.

[2] Fifty-one were built on the plans of Sir Christopher Wren.

and activity with which the period is not always duly credited. The stirring preaching of Dr. Horneck at the Savoy Chapel, and of Mr. Smythies at S. Michael's, Cornhill, affected some young men of the middle class in London, who formed themselves into societies, conducted on strictly Church lines, for the purpose of advancing their own spiritual life, and for doing Christian and benevolent work among the poor, and of supplying additional services in churches. From very humble beginnings, the work grew rapidly, and spread from London to all parts of the country. It did not reach its full development until a later reign; but it began in the time of Charles II., and the fathers of the society, Horneck, Smythies, Beveridge, and Bray, were all working clergymen at this period.

The same year, 1678, brought about a distinct change in the policy of the Church, owing to the death of Archbishop Sheldon, and the appointment of William Sancroft in his place. Both Sheldon and Sancroft were what would now be called High Churchmen; but Sheldon was of the political, Sancroft of the spiritual type; and the result was seen in an increase of spiritual work done on strictly Church lines, and a decrease, though unhappily not a cessation, of politico-ecclesiastical persecution.

Other episcopal appointments, notably that of Thomas Ken to Bath and Wells at the King's own desire a little before his death, were of the same character. Men of this type were not inclined to persecute either Protestant Dissenters or Roman Catholics; they saw 'a more excellent way' of advancing the interests of the Church. Deeply

imbued with her principles and best traditions themselves, they knew how to impress those principles, and hand down those traditions to others; and on the death of the King, in 1685, the Church was well prepared to meet the difficulties which awaited her in the next reign.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE STUART PERIOD.

*The Church in the Reign of James II.* (1685-1688).

James's attempts to bring England back to the Roman obedience —His efforts at the Universities—Conflict with Magdalen College, Oxford — Dean Sharp and Bishop Compton— The King's Declaration for Liberty of Conscience—Meeting of the seven bishops—Their petition to the King—Their trial and triumphant acquittal—Popularity and success of the Church at this period—Birth of a son to the King— Landing of William and flight of James—Divergent views of Churchmen on the crisis.

In spite of the attempts which had been made to exclude him, James II. succeeded to the throne as quietly as any of his predecessors; and if he had behaved with ordinary prudence, he might have reigned peacefully and happily notwithstanding his religious views. He began by showing great consideration for the clergy, and they on their parts were true to their principles, and accepted as their lawful King the man whose exclusion had been prevented very largely through their efforts. But James soon showed that his mission was to bring back the Church and nation to the Roman obedience, and he set himself to carry it out with all the zeal of a convert. Indeed, he outran the zeal, or the discretion, of the Pope himself, who actually remonstrated with him for being too forward and for showing his hand

too openly. He at once introduced Roman rites and Roman priests into the Chapels Royal. In itself this was natural enough; no fault could reasonably be found with him for desiring that the worship of God should be conducted in the places which he himself frequented according to the rites of that Church which he believed to be the only true Church in England. But it was a different matter when he began to proselytize in all directions. He commenced by pressing an abolition of the Test Act of 1673—in itself a most desirable thing, for the Act was detrimental to the true interests of the Church as well as unjust both to the Roman Catholics and Protestant Dissenters, who were alike liable to be persecuted under it. But his mode of dealing with the question might well cause alarm. When he could not persuade Parliament to abolish the Act, he took the matter into his own hands and suspended it on his own authority; and the Bishop of London (Dr. Compton), who remonstrated with him, was removed from the office of Dean of the Chapel Royal.[1] His amazing imprudence in planting a colony of Benedictine monks at S. James's, in establishing the Jesuits at the Savoy, the Franciscans at Lincoln's Inn, and the Carmelites in the city,[2] in sending an Ambassador-extraordinary to Rome 'to reconcile the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland to the Holy See,' in ostentatiously putting forward a Papal Nuncio in England, in appointing Roman Catholic clergy to preferments in England, defeated its own end.

[1] Hore's 'Church in England from William III. to Victoria,' i. 9.

[2] Perry, ii. 526.

But perhaps more dangerous still was his attempt to Romanize the Universities, which were the training-grounds of the future clergy of England. For a time he seemed likely to be successful in this bold stroke of policy. Samuel Parker, a real though not an avowed Romanist, was thrust into the bishopric of Oxford; the Master of University College (Dr. Obadiah Walker) and other members of the college, having gone over to the King's religion, were allowed to set up a Roman chapel within the college walls; another Roman Catholic (Dr. Massey) was made Dean of Christ Church; the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge was suspended from his office and from the headship of his college by the High Commission Court (which the King had ventured to revive), for refusing to admit a Benedictine monk to the degree of M.A. without the administration of any oath; and, finally, an attempt was made to force a Roman Catholic into the presidentship of Magdalen College, Oxford. Here, however, the King was met with a stout resistance. The Fellows steadily refused to obey the royal mandate, and persisted in the election of one of their own body, Dr. Hough. The High Commission Court suspended Dr. Hough and two of the Fellows, and in November, 1687, deprived all the Fellows; and Bishop Parker was then thrust into the presidentship.

The Church was now thoroughly alarmed, as well it might be. Able volumes and pamphlets issued from the press in its defence against Rome, and preachers gave forth no uncertain sound. The King issued an order to the bishops to prohibit all the inferior clergy from preaching on controversial points of divinity. Under the strong rule of the Tudors such an order

might have been, indeed *was*, obeyed. But James was not a Henry or an Elizabeth, and the seventeenth century was not the sixteenth, so of course the order was disobeyed.

The first among the preachers who was attacked for his moral courage in disobeying an illegal order was John Sharp, then Rector of S. Giles' and Dean of Norwich, afterwards the exemplary and very influential Archbishop of York. The King ordered Sharp's diocesan, Bishop Compton, to suspend him; the Bishop declined to do so, and was himself suspended by the High Commission Court, of which, that it might be as obnoxious as possible, the notorious Judge Jeffreys was made President.

But the King's policy had not even yet reached its climax. In the spring of 1687 he put forth *A Declaration for Liberty of Conscience*, ostensibly for the purpose of granting toleration all round, but obviously with the sole object of facilitating his schemes of Romanizing the Church of England. His brother's repeated failures to establish the right of exercising the dispensing power of the Crown in this way was no warning to him. Charles had the good sense to withdraw the claim, but James, who was much more intensely in earnest, persisted in it, and it became the proximate cause of his downfall. In the early part of the following year, 1688, the feelings of the people against Roman encroachments were raised to the highest pitch by the influx of a vast number of French Huguenots into England, who brought the most dismal accounts of the cruelties exercised against their co-religionists in France after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. At this most inopportune moment the infatuated James

ordered his Declaration for Liberty of Conscience to be read in all churches on two successive Sundays. The object of this order could only have been to compromise and humiliate the clergy; for the Declaration had already been before the country for a full year, and must have been perfectly well known. The loyalty of the Church was at last strained to the breaking-point. The Primate (Dr. Sancroft) called a meeting, at which were present the following Bishops: London (Dr. Compton), S. Asaph (Dr. Lloyd), Ely (Dr. Turner), Chichester (Dr. Lake), Bath and Wells (Dr. Ken), Bristol (Sir J. Trelawney), Peterborough (Dr. White); and the following leading divines: Tillotson (Dean of Canterbury), Stillingfleet (Dean of S. Paul's), Patrick (Dean of Peterborough), Tenison (Vicar of S. Martin's-in-the-Fields), Sherlock (Master of the Temple), and Grove (Rector of S. Andrew Undershaft). The Declaration was condemned in strong terms, and the bishops took it upon themselves to present a petition to the King, which Sancroft wrote with his own hand, while the suffragans subscribed their names. The petitioners declared that 'the great averseness they found in themselves to the distributing and publishing in all their churches the Declaration arose neither from disloyalty nor want of tenderness to Dissenters, but, among many other considerations, from this especially, because that Declaration is founded on such a dispensing power as hath been often declared illegal in Parliament, and particularly in 1662 and 1672, and in the beginning of your Majesty's reign; and is a matter of so great moment and consequence to the whole nation, both in Church and State, that your petitioners cannot in prudence, honour, or con-

science, so far make themselves parties to it, as the distribution of it all over the nation, and the solemn publication of it once and again, even in God's house, must amount to in common and reasonable construction.'

The petition was presented to the King at Whitehall by six bishops in person, the Primate being unable to accompany them, as he had been excluded from Court on account of his refusal to act in the revived Ecclesiastical Commission Court. The King received it with equal surprise and indignation. He thought that the loyalty of the Church would bear any strain ; it was largely through her influence that the persistent attempts to pass the Exclusion Bill had failed, and it was thus mainly to the Church that he owed his throne. He appears to have imagined that the deputation (as we should call them) were come to express their devotion and submission to himself. 'This,' he said when he glanced at the petition, 'is my Lord of Canterbury's hand'; and he proceeded to read the contents of the paper. 'This,' he exclaimed, 'is a great surprise to me. Here are strange words. I did not expect this from the Church of England. This is a standard of rebellion. This is a sounding of Sheba's trumpet, and all the seditious preachings of the Puritans in '40 were not of so ill consequence as this.' It would be, perhaps, unfair to weigh too carefully, or to take too literally, the words of an angry man ; otherwise, one might dwell on the utter absurdity of comparing the respectful language of men who only desired that they might not be pressed to break the law, with the vehement invectives of men who desired to alter the whole government of

Church and State. The petitioners were respectful, but very firm. They declared in all sincerity that they were thoroughly loyal, but that they themselves might claim the liberty which the King's Declaration itself promised to all mankind; to do what the King required them to do was against their conscience; they honoured the King, but they also feared God; if they had to suffer for disobedience to a lower, and for obedience to a higher law, then let God's will be done. Some days elapsed; but the bishops remained fixed in their resolution. The Declaration was read only in an insignificant minority of churches, and even in these there were strong indications of the popular feeling.[1]

Two Sundays passed over, and the King and his Council felt that something must be done. The bishops were indicted with a misdemeanour on the charge of presenting 'a treasonable and malicious libel,' as the humble and respectful petition, privately presented to the King, was absurdly called. As they refused to withdraw from their position, they were committed to the Tower, and then followed a scene which has few parallels in English history. They had the nation at their back; their progress to their prison was one continued triumph; the people kneeled down to receive their blessing; the very soldiers who guarded them did homage to their prisoners. They were conveyed by water, which was then the highroad between the West-End and

[1] When Dr. Spratt began to read it at Westminster Abbey, the congregation left the church, and his hands so shook that he could scarcely hold the document. See Hore's 'The Church in England from William III. to Victoria,' i. 23, where other instances are also given.

the East; and the banks of the Thames were lined all along with spectators, anxious at least to catch a glimpse of the seven heroic confessors, who were determined to obey God rather than man, and who, while ostensibly suffering for their refusal to proclaim liberty, were in reality fighting the battle both of civil and of religious liberty, against the only too well-known tyranny of Rome. All these ominous symptoms were lost upon the infatuated King. The bishops were brought back from the Tower to Westminster amid the same demonstrations of popular feeling which had greeted them before, and were tried on the charge of having written, 'under pretence of a petition, a certain false, pernicious, and scandalous libel.'[1] On their acquittal, the enthusiasm of the people passed all bounds, and on the news being spread through the country, the same feeling prevailed everywhere.

The popularity of the seven bishops was partly the cause, but partly also the result, of the great popularity of the Church at this period. The valuable services which she had rendered to the nation by the able defences written by her divines against the Roman claims, the absence of dissensions within her own pale,[2] the admirable practical work done in many parishes, both in the Metropolis and the country, and other causes, contributed to make

[1] It is noticeable that the bishops were tried in a criminal court for a civil offence.

[2] Roger North protests vehemently against White Kennet for antedating in his 'History of England' the distinctions of High Church and Low, and declares: 'There was not any dream then [at the time of the Restoration] of a distinction in the Church, but all were Conformists or Nonconformists, Churchmen or Dissenters, loyal or fanatic' ('Examen,' etc., p. 344).

the National Church an institution which was respected and trusted by the vast majority of Englishmen. In short, the Church was now at her strongest and her best. If matters had gone on as they had begun, most of the Nonconformists would probably have come over to her, and we might have seen realized the grand idea of a Church truly coextensive with the nation, and adequately supplying all that nation's spiritual wants. The Revolution introduced, as we shall see, an element of internal discord which at once crippled her energies, and also diverted them into other channels; but all the evidence tends to show that the early biographer of one of the best of those clergy who throw so bright a lustre upon this period did not overstate the case when he wrote: 'The Church of England was never known to be in a more flourishing condition than at this time; all things duly weighed, it became much more powerful by the opposition made against it, and grew by the favours indulged to its adversaries. The number of converts made in the reign of this King [James] to his religion was most inconsiderable, and their service to him still more inconsiderable, if it could be said to be any at all. On the other side, for every one that was lost to the established religion, it was thought there were ten at least added to it another way, for certain great numbers of Dissenters were brought into the communion of the Church by the learned writings of the orthodox clergy.'[1]

The exasperation against King James was heightened by the birth, on June 10, 1688, of a son whom some really believed, and others pretended to believe,

[1] Lee's 'Life of Kettlewell,' p. 59.

to be supposititious. The son of James and Mary of Modena was sure to be brought up in the straitest sect of the Roman religion, and the danger of a return to the days of Queen Mary was seriously heightened. Men might have been contented to bear with a Roman Catholic King, however inclined to proselytize, who was past the meridian of life ; but it was a different matter when the gloomy prospect of a successor who would probably be at least as bigoted as his father loomed before them. When it was too late, James sought, and to a certain extent listened to, the counsel of those very bishops whom he had striven, but happily in vain, to punish. They advised him to advance no more Roman Catholics to preferments in the Church, to dissolve the obnoxious High Commission Court, to restore the Fellows of Magdalen to their posts, and to allow the college to have as its President the man of its choice—which he did, through the instrumentality of the Bishop of Winchester, the Visitor of the college—and to make other wise concessions to the popular feeling. A year earlier such concessions might have been availing ; but now ' a deliverer ' was at hand. On November 5, 1688, William landed at Torbay ; James fled, and left the throne vacant. Some persuaded themselves that such an abdication freed their consciences from their former oaths of allegiance ; others clung to the idea of a regency, on the ground that the lawful Sovereign was as incapable of reigning as if he had been a minor or of unsound mind ;[1] others drew a distinction between a Sovereign *de facto* and a

[1] This was the view of the bishops. See Evelyn's Diary, January 15, 1688-89. The measure proposing a regency was only lost in the Lords by a majority of two.

Sovereign *de jure*, and argued that in the absence of the latter they might submit to the former without any glaring inconsistency, in spite of their expressed adherence to the doctrine of Divine right; others were irreconcilable, and remained not only non-jurors, but active Jacobites; others boldly justified the lawfulness of a merely Parliamentary title. The question was essentially a religious quite as much as a political one; and hence the unhappy James, by his flight, sowed the seed of internal dissensions in a Church which for the last fifty years had been on the whole comparatively free from such dissensions. The Revolution of 1688-89, if it brought peace to the State, assuredly introduced discord into the Church.[1]

[1] For a fuller account of all these events, see Lathbury's 'History of the Nonjurors,' *passim*.

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE STUART PERIOD.

*The Church in the Reign of William III. and Mary II.* (1689-1702).

Increase of party distinctions in the Church—Welding together of the Latitudinarian party—William III. dislikes High Churchmen—Vacancies to be filled—Gilbert Burnet—John Tillotson—Henry Compton—Fifteen new bishops—Case of the Nonjurors—Act of Toleration—Comprehension Bill—Commission to revise the Prayer-Book—Antagonism between Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation—Archbishops Tillotson and Tenison reluctant to summon Convocation—Church government by Royal Injunctions—Church patronage and affairs in the hands of Mary and Tillotson—Death of both in 1694—Thomas Tenison—'Letter to a Convocation Man'—Wake and Atterbury on Convocations—Disputes between Upper and Lower Houses about heretical books—Practical work of the Church—The Religious Societies and Societies for the Reformation of Manners—Origin of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge—And of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts—Parochial libraries—Charity schools—Boyle Lectures—Death of King James and of King William.

It was remarked at the close of the last chapter that one of the most striking features of the period between the Restoration and the Revolution was the absence of party distinctions within the Church itself; but a great change took place. For some time a class of divines, who had no bond of union among themselves beyond the negative one of desiring a greater latitude of opinion than was generally

thought admissible, had been making their influence felt in the Church. Politics, however, now formed among them a very strong bond of union, and from the accession of William III. may be dated the rise of the Broad Churchmen (to anticipate a name which was not in use until many years later),[1] who combined Whig politics with a liberal theology, and who for nearly a hundred years held a large share of the highest preferments in the Church. King William himself was naturally inclined to favour this party. Brought up in Holland, he was personally a Dutch Presbyterian. Presbyterianism in Holland was not, perhaps, in all respects of the same rigid type as in Scotland, but it was equally opposed to the distinctive doctrines and system of the Church of England. Before he landed on our shores William had already shown his dislike of that type of Churchmanship of which Sancroft and Ken were leading representatives. His wife had imported from her old home to the Hague chaplains of this character, including the saintly Ken himself, and George Hooper, his like-minded predecessor at the Hague and successor at Bath and Wells. They had never met with the approval of William, who had expressed his determination not to promote such men if ever he came to reign in England. Sooner, perhaps, than he expected, he had the opportunity of carrying out his determination on an exceptionally

[1] They were at first generally called Low Churchmen. The 'latitude men' of the Commonwealth and Restoration periods were really of quite a different type from those here referred to, though frequently identified with them; but the term 'latitudinarian' gradually crept in to describe the party which now became dominant.

large scale. The refusal of nine[1] bishops and several other dignitaries to take the oath of allegiance to the new sovereigns created an extraordinary number of vacancies which had to be filled up at once. But there was a counsellor near at hand, who was able, and more than ready, to show him how to fill them up in the way that he desired.

*Gilbert Burnet* (1643-1715) was the King's chaplain, and was the first man in the new reign promoted to a bishopric. He was made Bishop of Salisbury after having refused the more wealthy see of Durham. He had thoroughly won the confidence of William, who was greatly influenced by him in the ecclesiastical appointments which were subsequently made. By birth and education Burnet was a Scotch Presbyterian, and though he afterwards conformed to the English Church, he never lost the predilections of his early life. He had a strong antipathy to what now began to be called High Churchmanship, and agreed with his master that no man of that tendency should be promoted to high places in the Church, though he certainly made exceptions.[2] He had many good points, being active in his own spiritual work and an encourager of activity and earnestness in others. But he was a thorough partisan, and had no sympathy whatever with the Catholic spirit that breathes through every line of the English Prayer-Book. As he knew the English better than William did, he naturally had much to do with the ecclesiastical appointments after the Revolution. It would be most congenial work to him, appealing both to the strong and the weak sides of his character. On

[1] But one died before the actual time for taking the oath came.

[2] Patrick, for instance, was strongly recommended by Burnet.

the one hand, he really had the welfare of religion at heart, and desired to see others labour for what he regarded to be right, as he did himself; so his better nature would lead him to be anxious that those whom he considered the best men should be promoted. On the other hand, he was bustling and meddlesome, and enjoyed sitting in judgment upon —his enemies said, slandering—his brother clergy, and on this account also he embraced with effusion the opportunity of promoting men of his own way of thinking, and excluding all who in the earlier period had certainly formed the most influential party in the Church.

The other chief ecclesiastical adviser both of William and of Mary was *John Tillotson* (1630-1694), who was Dean of Canterbury at the time of the Revolution, and was at once translated by William to the deanery of S. Paul's. In point of disposition and character, Tillotson was the very antipodes of Burnet, being a retiring, sensitive man, who never spoke evil of any. But the two agreed in their religious views; both had been trained in the Puritan school, and both had developed into pronounced Latitudinarians. Tillotson was the son of a Calvinistic clothier at Sowerby, near Halifax, and had been educated in his early days by his grandfather, Mr. Dod, a strict Puritan. He then proceeded to Clare Hall, Cambridge, where his tutor, Mr. Clarkson, who had great influence over him, was also a strict Puritan. He had then been elected Fellow of Clare in 1651, of course under Puritan auspices. He lost his Fellowship at the Restoration as a Nonconformist, but conformed after the Act of 1662. He married a niece of Oliver Cromwell, and numbered among

his intimate friends Thomas Firmin, a benevolent Socinian; Dr. Bates, the Presbyterian Vicar of S. Dunstan's-in-the-West; William Penn, the Quaker; John Howe, the Independent; and a Mr. Gouge, a Dissenter, whose funeral sermon he preached. With such antecedents and surroundings, it is not difficult to anticipate in what direction his influence would tend, when he was raised, much against his will, to the primacy of all England. Some little time, however, elapsed before this took place. In the natural course of things, Sancroft could not be deprived before February 1, 1690, and in his case a little further law was allowed. The real Primate, in all but in name, during the first two years of the new reign was *Henry Compton* (1633-1713), who had already been Bishop of London for twenty years, and who was thoroughly in sympathy with the strong Protestant views of the King; and, as her old tutor and chaplain, he would naturally be a *persona grata* to the Queen also. It was expected by many that Compton would be appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in the place of Sancroft, and his being passed over was a marked disappointment to himself; but he never had the confidence of the King to the same extent that Tillotson or Burnet had.[1]

[1] Dean Milman thus sums up Compton's claims upon William and Mary: 'He had been preceptor to the Queen and to her sister. He had borne the whole brunt of the battle; he had been the first to resist the ecclesiastical encroachments of the King. Compton had voted for the Exclusion Bill; he had corresponded with the Prince of Orange; he had signed (the one single prelate) the invitation to the Prince; he had exercised the great function of the Primate at the coronation of the King and Queen. To Compton's bitter disappointment, the dean of his own church was advanced over his head' ('Annals of S. Paul's Cathedral,' ch. xvii., p. 416).

During the first two years of the reign of William and Mary no less than fifteen new bishops were appointed, and Burnet declares complacently that 'they were generally looked on as the learnedest, the wisest, and best men that were in the Church,'[1] himself being among the number. Six of these were appointed in 1689, namely, Burnet to Salisbury; Humphrey Humphries to Bangor; Nicholas Stratford, Dean of S. Asaph, to Chester; Edward Stillingfleet, Dean of S. Paul's, to Worcester; Simon Patrick, Dean of Peterborough, to Chichester; and Gilbert Ironside to Bristol. In 1690 the courageous John Hough, President of Magdalen, who had made so bold a stand two years before against the tyranny of James, was consecrated Bishop of Oxford; More was appointed to Norwich; Cumberland to Peterborough; Edward Fowler to Gloucester; Grove to Chichester, in the room of Patrick, translated to Ely; Hall to Bristol, in the room of Ironside, translated to Hereford; Kidder to Bath and Wells; Sharp to the archbishopric of York; and, finally, Tillotson to the archbishopric of Canterbury. The unusual number of vacancies was, of course, in part created by the refusal of no less than eight[2] bishops to take the oaths. The names of these prelates were Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury; Turner, Bishop of Ely; Lake, of Chichester; Ken, of Bath and Wells; White, of Peterborough; Thomas, of Worcester; Lloyd, of Norwich; and Frampton, of Gloucester. It will be observed that five of these (Sancroft, Turner, Lake, Ken, and White) were of the number of the redoubtable seven who had been

[1] 'History of his Own Times,' vol. iii., p. 104.

[2] The ninth was now dead.

sent to the Tower for declining to sanction King James's illegal Declaration. Three of them (Thomas, White, and Lake) died before the sentence of their deprivation could be carried out, but not before they had expressed their thorough determination to abide by their decision. About 400 clergy followed the example of their spiritual fathers, and a sprinkling of laity, and the loss to the National Church through their withdrawal was far greater than the paucity of numbers would indicate. It is a sad pity that some means could not have been devised for retaining them. The two stumbling-blocks were the oaths of allegiance to the new sovereigns, and the mention by name of those sovereigns in the liturgy. It had never been customary to require from a clergyman any oath of allegiance at the beginning of a new reign, but only at his own institution to a benefice. Of course the circumstances under which William and Mary came to the throne were exceptional; but this told both ways: if it was desirable to obtain additional security for loyalty to sovereigns who had at best but a doubtful title, it was also desirable to retain all who could possibly be retained without endangering the stability of the throne.[1] From a Churchman's point of view

[1] It was not a mere trifle at which the nonjurors scrupled when they found themselves obliged to use what were called the 'immoral prayers.' To use the forcible language of Mr. Abbey: 'In 1687 and 1688 they had been called to pray for King James "that his seed might endure for ever," and "be set up after him, and his house and kingdom be established"; that their gracious King might be preserved in all his undertakings, and that "the princely infant might excel in all virtues becoming to the royal dignity to which God had ordained him." A few months after public prayers were being offered that their late monarch, as one of the enemies of the new King, might be

the loss of such men as John Kettlewell, the saintly Vicar of Coleshill; George Hickes, the very learned Dean of Worcester; Charles Leslie, perhaps the ablest defender of the Church against enemies from all sides then living; Denis Granville, the vigorous Dean of Durham, who had done more than any man to raise the tone of our cathedral services; Robert Nelson, the most popular Church writer and most indefatigable Church worker of the day; Nathaniel Spinckes, a devotional writer, who thoroughly lived up to the life he recommended to others; Henry Dodwell, as good and learned as he was eccentric; Francis Cherry, the very type of a good country gentleman, and many others that might be named, was irreparable. Their case was quite different from that of the ejected ministers in 1662. So far from being dissatisfied with the doctrine, discipline, or formularies of the Church of England, they were the most ardent and consistent supporters of them. They were ready to live quietly without disturbing the existing government; very few of them became active Jacobites; indeed, they had at least as strong reasons to distrust James as any of their opponents; but they could not divest themselves of the conviction that their former oaths to him were still binding. They all looked forward to a time when they could again join the National Church; some saw their way to doing this earlier than others, but to all it was the consummation devoutly to be wished.

---

"vanquished and overcome," and that not James, but William, might be "protected in person, and his hands strengthened."' See 'The English Church in the Eighteenth Century,' i. 144. It is fair to say that Mr. Abbey adds: 'All this was, no doubt, unavoidable, and the inconsistency more apparent than real,' etc.

Meanwhile many of them lived in the most friendly relations with those Churchmen whose consciences did not forbid them to conform to the new order of things. Sancroft still retained his chaplains who had taken the oaths, and trusted 'that though the swearers and they went by different ways, Heaven's gates would be wide enough to receive both.'[1] Ken said to Hooper: 'I am satisfied that you take the oaths with as clear and well-resolved conscience as I refused them.'[2] Frampton communicated at his parish church at Standish; Nelson preserved his friendship with Tillotson and nursed him in his last illness; Hickes actually joined housekeeping with White Kennet, who was perhaps more obnoxious to the nonjurors than any other 'swearer.' On the other side, a large body of the complying clergy interceded in behalf of their non-complying brethren in the most earnest and passionate language. Sharp and Beveridge certainly, and others probably, declined to accept any sees vacant by the deprivation of nonjurors. King William himself offered to excuse the oath altogether, if Dissenters might be excused the sacramental test; and to render the oath less objectionable, the words 'rightful and lawful' Sovereign were omitted.[3]

But these amenities mostly occurred in the early stage of the nonjuring separation; as years went on the breach widened. This was only natural when the Church was becoming more and more permeated with latitudinarian views in high places; and all the more so, because those high places were occupied by

[1] See Lee's 'Life of Kettlewell,' iii. 159.
[2] Bowles' 'Life of Ken,' ii. 255.
[3] For more details, see Lathbury's 'History of the Nonjurors.'

men of real distinction. Without going quite so far as to say, with Burnet, that 'King William's bishops,' as they were called, were 'the learnedest, wisest, and best men then in the Church,' it is undeniable that there were some singularly distinguished men among them. Tillotson himself had a splendid reputation, and was thought to have brought the art of preaching to perfection. John Sharp, who was made Archbishop of York through Tillotson's influence, was one of the most estimable characters and one of the most successful prelates that any age has produced; he was a marked High Churchman, and made no secret whatever of his proclivities, but his transparent honesty and simple, unaffected piety endeared him to all parties. Stillingfleet was, perhaps, the ablest and most learned clergyman then living; and Patrick carried with him to his diocese the same shining qualities which had made him a model parish-priest. At the same time, it was a distinct misfortune to the Church that her dignitaries should be, as a rule, on one side, while 'the inferior clergy' were, as a body, on the other; and the evil results of the disagreement soon appeared in connection with the Church's constitutional assembly. But before launching into the stormy sea of the Convocation controversy, it will be well to notice some other matters in connection with this new era in the Church's history.

One good effect of the 'liberal spirit' which now pervaded the Church and nation was the passing, in 1689, of the *Act of Toleration*. It may seem to *our* eyes but a small instalment of that religious liberty which a citizen may fairly claim, so far as State interference is concerned; for it gave no relief

to any except those who were called 'orthodox Protestant Dissenters,' and even these were still subject to many disabilities. Their teachers had to attest their allegiance, and to subscribe to the thirty-six doctrinal articles of the Church of England; and then they might teach, and their congregations might assemble in certified places of worship, without fear of molestation from penal laws. All Roman Catholics, and all who did not fully accept the received doctrine of the Trinity, were expressly excluded from the benefit of the Act. Nonjurors were still obliged to assemble by stealth in private houses. Roman Catholics, indeed, were in a harder condition than ever. New penal laws were enacted against them in William's reign. Still, in spite of its many limitations, the Act of Toleration was a step in the right direction, and abated materially a great injustice done to a large number of the King's subjects. The Act was no detriment to the true interests of the Church, but quite the reverse. The Church of England needs no artificial props to keep up her influence; such props, on the contrary, give her an appearance of weakness which certainly does not exist.

As a matter of fact, the passing of the Toleration Act resulted in a very large increase of professing Churchmen; but what was gained in breadth was lost in depth. The same tone of mind, which gave (very properly) greater liberty to others, also caused a lamentable loss of definiteness in Church principles. There is no necessary connection between the two things. A man may hold his own opinions in the strongest and most uncompromising fashion, and yet desire to give to others the same liberty. But,

unfortunately, this was not the case with those whom we are now considering. There is a perceptible lowering of the type of Churchmanship, a want of grip of true Church principles, after the Revolution. This is signally illustrated in another Bill which was brought in side by side with the Toleration Bill.

Schemes of comprehension had been frequently discussed ever since the days of the Hampton Court Conference; and both the Church and the King were now bound by their former utterances to entertain some idea of a comprehension. The bishops in their petition to King James against the Declaration of Liberty of Conscience had asserted that 'they had no want of tenderness to Dissenters, in relation to whom they were willing to come to such a temper as should be thought fit when that matter should be considered and settled in Parliament and Convocation;' and in proof of the sincerity of this assertion, Sancroft and others had immediately afterwards begun to devise a scheme of comprehension. William in his Declaration as Prince of Orange had promised to 'endeavour a good agreement between the Church of England and all Protestant Dissenters, and to cover and secure all those who would live peaceably under the government from all persecution on account of their religion;' and, when he was King, he promised in his reply to the addresses of the Dissenters that he would do all in his power to obtain a union between his Protestant subjects on terms wherein all the Reformed Churches agree.[1]

Accordingly, in April, 1689, a few days before the introduction of the Toleration Bill, the Earl of Not-

[1] Perry, p. 543.

tingham, a man of high character whom all respected, introduced a *Comprehension Bill*, or a Bill of Union, in the House of Lords, which passed that House; but when it was brought into the Commons, they refused even to discuss it, on the very proper ground that 'it contained matters relating to the Church in which the representative body of the clergy had not been so much as advised with.' They therefore begged the King, first of all, to issue writs for the convening of Convocation. William took counsel with Tillotson (as yet only Dean of S. Paul's), who informed him that, as the Parliament was only a convention Parliament, Convocation could not yet assemble, but that when a constitutional Parliament met, Convocation should meet with it to discuss the Comprehension project. But, that matters might be put into shape, a commission was formed to discuss what alterations in the Prayer-Book might be suggested to please the Dissenters. As the work of the commissioners happily came to nothing, it is unnecessary to specify the details of it. The old, old questions of the Apocryphal Lessons, the wording of the liturgy, the kneeling at the altar-rails to receive the Holy Communion, sponsors and the sign of the Cross at Holy Baptism, the repetition of the *Gloria Patri* at the end of each Psalm, the meaning of the Lenten fast, and so forth, were again revived; and on November 12, 1689, the Convocation of Canterbury assembled. The mind of the Lower House was at once indicated in its choice of a Prolocutor. There were two candidates: Dr. Tillotson, Dean of S. Paul's, and Dr. Jane, Dean of Gloucester and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. Dr. Tillotson was the more prominent

man, but he represented the Low Church party; Dr. Jane represented the High Church, and was elected by a majority of two to one. The customary Latin speech of the new Prolocutor was ominous in regard to the fate of the commissioners' work. He intimated that the Book of Common Prayer required no alterations, and concluded with the famous words: 'Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari.'[1]

And now broke out that antagonism between the Upper House, where the Low Church element was predominant, and the Lower, where the High Churchmen had it all their own way, which ultimately led to the virtual silencing of Convocation for 135 years. In the absence of the Metropolitan,[2] the Bishop of London, Dr. Compton, was President of this Convocation. Having received the Prolocutor's address, and having exhorted the two Houses to work in unity, (which was more easily said than done), he prorogued the Convocation until December 4, because the loss of the Great Seal had made the appointment of the royal commission for the review of the liturgy irregular. When Convocation reassembled, there was evidently so strong a feeling in the Lower House against the recommendations of the commissioners

[1] These were the words which the President of this Convocation, Dr. Compton, Bishop of London, to whom, of course, the speech was addressed, had had inscribed in golden letters on his standard when 'at the head of a noble troop of gentlemen,' and clad in martial array, he conducted the Princess Anne into Oxford in 1688. They were intended partly to show that the Lower House meant to be faithful to the maxim, and partly as a severe hit at the warlike Bishop and President.

[2] Archbishop Sancroft had not yet been actually deprived, so 'the absence of the Metropolitan' seems to me a more fitting expression than 'the vacancy of the archbishopric,' which is sometimes used.

that they were not even discussed. An address to the King in reply to his message was with difficulty agreed to, and Convocation was prorogued without anything further being done. Thus Burnet's prophecy that 'Convocation would be the ruin of the Comprehension scheme' came true.

Few Churchmen will regret that the project was abortive. The latest scheme for Comprehension really went further than that rejected at the Savoy Conference. It would have gone far to Presbyterianize the Church. It did not even please the majority of the Dissenters, who were shrewd enough to see that the only result could be to satisfy one alone out of the three denominations, the Presbyterians, of whom the other two had always been rather jealous. And, to take another ground, the alterations in the liturgy were, as a matter of taste, very much for the worse. The beautiful English of our Book of Common Prayer would have been simply ruined if it had been left to the tender mercies of the reviewers.

The fate of this Convocation made Tillotson, who had been the adviser of the King in convening it, rather doubtful about the expediency of such gatherings; so, when he became Archbishop of Canterbury, he hesitated about summoning Convocation for the despatch of business. His successor followed the same policy, and thus, as Bishop Burnet is pleased to express it, 'seeing they were in no disposition to enter upon business, they were kept from doing mischief for a course of ten years.' Whether 'useful work' should not be substituted for 'mischief' is a question which need not be discussed. Instead of its proper constitutional assembly, the Church had now

to be content with that most unchurchlike system of government by royal injunctions.[1] Under any circumstances this method would have savoured too much of pure Erastianism; but when the Sovereign was not an English Churchman at all, except by the accident of his position, we can well understand how those clergy who were outside the charmed circle of King William's bishops should have chafed against it.

William, however, was too much occupied with his civil troubles at home and his wars abroad to take much personal interest in Church concerns. These were left very much in the hands of Queen Mary, under the guidance of Archbishop Tillotson. The unexpected death, therefore, of both, within a few weeks of each other, in 1694, marked an epoch in the Church's history. Tillotson was the first to be called away. He would probably have held a higher reputation with posterity, and would certainly have been a happier man in his declining years, if he had not yielded, most reluctantly, to the solicitations of his royal master to accept the archbishopric of Canterbury, which was only vacant by the uncanonical deprivation of Sancroft. It required a thick-skinned man like Burnet to undertake so invidious a task with any comfort to himself. Tillotson, on the contrary, was a singularly sensitive man. He was regarded as the leader of the latitudinarian intruders, and a torrent of invectives from those who sympathized with the nonjurors, whether they followed their example or not, fell upon his devoted

[1] Of course, there were precedents for this plan in the Tudor days. It was, in fact, a revival of one of the weak points of the Reformation period.

head. He was ill able to bear such a burden, and he felt its weight keenly, though with true Christian charity he abstained from retaliating. There is something inexpressibly touching in the story that after his death a bundle of papers was found labelled thus in his own handwriting, 'These are libels; God forgive the writers of them as I do.'

The man who was obviously marked out as Tillotson's successor was Edward Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester. No one held so high a reputation for learning, acuteness, and general ability; the Queen herself was most anxious for his appointment; but his health was delicate, and 'both his notions and his temper were too high'—at least in Burnet's opinion; so he was passed over, and the primacy was conferred upon *Thomas Tenison* (1636-1715), who had been a most exemplary and energetic parish priest, and a fairly respectable Bishop of Lincoln; but he was not strong enough to be Archbishop of Canterbury, especially when so strong a man as Stillingfleet was available. In one respect, however, he was more suited for the post than his predecessor: he was not troubled with sensitiveness; there was a certain stolidity about him which made his friends call him 'an old rock,' and his enemies 'a dull and heavy man.'[1] He was, perhaps, a little more of a Churchman than Tillotson, but belonged in the main to the same school of thought, and pursued the same line

[1] Hearne, the nonjuror and antiquary, calls him 'y^e^ heavy Archbishop of Canterbury,' 'y^e^ Loggerhead at Lambeth.' See Hearne's 'Collections' (Oxf. Hist. Soc.), *passim*, where the references to Tenison are very numerous, and all of the same uncomplimentary type as those quoted above. Dean Swift said he was 'as hot and heavy as a tailor's goose.'

of Church policy, notably in the matter of Convocation.

The death of the Queen from small-pox a few weeks after that of her friend and adviser was a distinct loss to the Church. She had formed a sort of link between the High Church and the Low Church parties, bearing traces of the influence of Tillotson and Compton on the one hand, and of Lake, Ken, and Hooper on the other.[1] She had discharged the extremely responsible and delicate task of regulating Church affairs, so far as they came within the domain of the Crown, with wonderful fairness and judgment, considering how young a creature she was. She was placed in a cruel dilemma when she had to choose between her duty to her husband and her duty to her father. Nobody can blame her for adhering to the former, though she might perhaps have done so with a little more regard to the feelings of the latter. That she aimed, according to her lights, at being a nursing mother of the Church is undeniable.

As Church patronage had been left very much in the hands of the Queen, and as her chief ecclesiastical adviser, Archbishop Tillotson, was also dead, the King appointed a commission of ten bishops and twenty priests to nominate fit persons to him; and in 1695 the royal injunctions, which had been framed under the direction of Tillotson before his

[1] It is curious that Dr. Edward Lake, the strong High Churchman, was introduced as chaplain and tutor into the service of the Princesses Mary and Anne by Dr. Compton, Bishop of London, the Low Churchman; but this only illustrates what I have said before, viz., that between the Restoration and the Revolution the division of parties in the Church was not nearly so marked as it afterwards became.

death, were put forth. These were followed by another royal manifesto, which led to the revival once more of the active powers of Convocation. The Trinitarian controversy, which reached its height at a later period, had broken out after an interval of more than a thousand years, and men were treating this fundamental doctrine as a curious problem to be argued about and explained, rather than as a mystery to be adored. It was quite right, therefore, to strive to put a stop to such unprofitable wranglings; but it was a day too late to make the attempt by means of royal injunctions. Similar attempts had, as we have seen, been made in earlier times, but they were hardly suited to the closing years of the seventeenth century. The proper way of dealing with such questions was through the Church's lawful synod, and in 1697 there appeared the famous 'Letter to a Convocation Man,' which again revived the question of Convocation. The writer of the 'Letter' affirmed that 'the Convocation has a right, not only to meet every session of Parliament, but to sit and transact business without the royal license.' In reply, Wake published his famous work on 'The Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods' (1697), contending, among other things, that the Act of the Submission of the Clergy prevented them from treating of ecclesiastical matters without the royal permission. In answer to Wake, Atterbury published 'The Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation' (1700); and, in answer to Atterbury, White Kennet published his 'Ecclesiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations in the Church of England, historically stated' (1701), the main argument of

which has been discussed elsewhere.[1] There were, of course, other writers on both sides, but these were the chief.

It will be seen that the controversy turned, not so much on the functions, as on the right of convening such assemblies. The practical upshot was that, after an abeyance of more than ten years, the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury was again summoned in 1700 for the despatch of business. Archbishop Tenison was not more favourable to Convocation than Archbishop Tillotson had been; and the events which had occurred since 1689 certainly did not encourage the hope that there would be more unanimity between the two Houses. The event proved that there was not. A dispute arose on the subject of condemning heretical books. In 1701 a book was adduced which would certainly, if any book did, come under that denomination, viz., Toland's 'Christianity not Mysterious,' one of the most noted contributions to the Deistical literature of the period. But the Upper House disputed the right of the Lower House to censure. A little later in the year the Lower House flew, if the expression may be allowed, at higher game, and submitted to the bishops in the Upper House that a work written by one of the most prominent members of that House deserved the censure of Convocation. This was none other than the redoubted Bishop Burnet himself, whose book on 'The Thirty-nine Articles,' tended, they said, to encourage the very doctrines which it was the express object of the Articles to condemn. The bishops, of course, defended their brother, one might almost say their champion, and

[1] See i. 252-255.

contended rather feebly that he deserved the thanks of the Church for his excellent 'History of the Reformation.' This was scarcely to the point: because a man had written a good book on one subject, that was no reason why he should not have written a bad one on another. In the midst of these discussions King William died, March 4, 1702, and the further proceedings of Convocation belong to the next chapter.

It must not be supposed that these disputes between High Church and Low Church, jurors and nonjurors, Jacobites and Williamites, exhausted all the energies of the Church. On the contrary, it is wonderful how, in the divided state of men's minds, so much active, useful work was done, and it is a real refreshment to turn from controversy to such work. The rise of the *Religious Societies* in 1678 has been noticed in a former chapter. These societies not only throve, but very greatly enlarged the sphere of their work during the period before us, when they were well supported by the dignitaries of the Church, the Archbishop of Canterbury (Tillotson) and the Bishop of London (Compton) both being their warm advocates. They were also clearly connected with the rise of another class of societies with which they are sometimes confused, but which were in reality quite different organizations, with different objects, different constitutions, and different principles. These were the *Societies for the Reformation of Manners,* which sprung, in 1692, from a royal proclamation against vice and immorality, and had for their object the carrying into effect the intention of that proclamation. It is very characteristic of the difference between the two periods that, whereas

in the earlier the strictest Churchmanship had been insisted upon, in the later Churchmen and Dissenters were mixed together indiscriminately. But the originators of the Reformation societies were five or six Churchmen, who induced Queen Mary, through the medium of her friend, Bishop Stillingfleet, to issue royal letters in 1691, admonishing the magistrates to do their duty. This was followed by the proclamation aforesaid, and then the societies set about their work. One society was composed of lawyers and magistrates, and devoted itself to the work of putting the laws into force, and procuring subscriptions towards the expenses of prosecutions; another was composed of tradesmen, whose special work was the suppression of debauchery in the streets; another undertook the invidious office of informers. Archbishop Tillotson and his successor, Archbishop Tenison, took up the matter warmly, the latter issuing a circular letter to his suffragans, begging them to urge their clergy to help on the good work. We have strong and varied evidence from contemporaries of the beneficial effects produced by the societies; but it is not surprising that they were far from being universally approved of. Some, as Archbishop Sharp, objected to the combination of Churchmen and Dissenters; others thought that they committed the converse of an error, very prevalent at the time, by confusing the provinces of the Church and State, and interfering with the office of the State, as the State had so often interfered with the office of the Church. Moreover, the rôle of informer is never a very pleasant rôle to play, and from these and other causes the societies died a natural death.

A far more long-lived and unexceptionable institution was the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, which was due to the indefatigable and self-denying efforts of one man, Dr. Thomas Bray. It arose from the fact that in 1695 he was appointed commissary to the Bishop of London (Compton) in Maryland. In seeking out missionaries to be sent abroad, he found that he could only enlist poor men unable to buy books, and this led him to project a scheme for establishing parochial libraries in every deanery throughout England and Wales. The library scheme soon became part of a larger scheme which took shape in the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The first sketch of the objects of the society, which included the libraries at home and abroad, charity schools, and missions both to colonists and the heathen, was prepared by Bray, and he was one of the first five members, and the only clergyman among them, who composed the first meeting on March 8, 1698-9. The other members were, Francis, Lord Guilford, Sir Humphrey Mackworth, Justice Hook, and Colonel Maynard Chichester. The first resolution at this first meeting had reference to the design of 'erecting catechetical schools in every parish in and about London'; then Dr. Bray was requested to lay before the society his scheme for promoting religion in the Plantations; then the five members agreed to contribute £12 towards the printing of good books to be circulated among the poor, steps having been previously taken for founding lending libraries in America. It was not until 1705 that the society agreed to set apart a portion of its funds to furnish the poor in the country with Bibles and Prayer-Books at a cheap rate.

The sixth member elected was John Chamberlayne, the first secretary of the society; others quickly followed; but at the first eight meetings (which were held weekly) only five members were present. Men of all parties in the Church were found among the earliest and warmest supporters of a society which was designed for the *whole* Church, not any one section of it exclusively. Tenison and Burnet and Kidder and Fowler and White Kennet joined with Patrick and Lloyd and Thomas Wilson and Robert Nelson and Samuel Wesley, all apparently working in perfect harmony; and men of wide and general interests, such as William Melmoth (a bencher of the Temple), Sir Richard Blackmore (the physician and versifier), Strype (the antiquary), Gilbert White (the naturalist), John Evelyn (of 'Diary' and 'Silva' fame), and Ernest Grabe (the universal scholar), joined in the good work. For the first ten years of its existence it was known as the Society for *Propagating* Christian Knowledge.

*The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts* was an offshoot of the S.P.C.K. When Dr. Bray returned from Maryland in the early spring of 1700-1, he found that the various designs of his newly-founded society were too extensive for any one association; he therefore proposed the establishment of a separate society, whose object should be to propagate the Gospel throughout the foreign possessions of the British Empire. The work had already engaged the attention of Convocation, and would probably have been carried out by that body; but, as a matter of fact, the credit of procuring a royal charter for constituting the new society a body corporate belongs primarily to Dr. Bray, and next

to Archbishop Tenison and Bishop Compton, who pressed on the matter in a way that perhaps no private clergyman could have done. To these names must be added that of Humphrey Prideaux, afterwards Dean of Norwich, whose appeals to the Primate, six years earlier, no doubt contributed to secure Tenison's hearty services. On June 27, 1701, the first meeting of the society was held at Lambeth under the Archbishop's direction, and before the death of King William it was fairly afloat. From the beginning the work of the society was twofold—viz., as the charter expresses it, 'To provide learned and orthodox ministers for our loving subjects,' and 'To make other such provision as may be necessary for propagating the Gospel in those parts'; or, as Dr. Willis, Dean of Lincoln, the preacher of the first anniversary sermon, in 1702, more fully states it: 'The design is, in the first place, to settle the state of religion as well as may be among our own people in the foreign plantations; and then to proceed, in the best methods they can, towards the conversion of the natives.'

The *Parochial Libraries* scheme, though projected and matured during William's reign, did not take definite shape until a later period; and the same may be said of the scheme of *Charity Schools*, though isolated instances of the foundation of such schools may certainly be found before Dr. Bray gave an impetus to the work. Thus, the Bluecoat School belonging to S. Margaret's, Westminster, was founded in 1688; the school at S. Martin's-in-the-Fields, established by the joint exertions of Tenison and Patrick, because the Romanists had founded a free school in the precincts of the Savoy, certainly dates from the reign of James II.

One more instance of practical work in the reign of William and Mary occurs in the foundation of the *Boyle Lectures*. Robert Boyle, son of the Earl of Cork, died on December 30, 1691, and left by his will £50 a year for a course of eight lectures to be preached annually by 'some divine or preaching minister in defence of the Christian religion against Atheists, Deists, Pagans, Jews, and Mahomedans.'[1] The first lecturer was the ablest divine then living, Bishop Stillingfleet; and among subsequent lecturers may be found the most eminent names of the day.

It only remains to notice that the death of King James, in 1701, so far from removing an obstacle to union, as might have been hoped, only tended to create a greater obstacle than ever. It led to the enactment of the Abjuration Oath, which required not only the abjuration of the Pretender, but also the acceptance of William as 'rightful and lawful King.' The natural result was that some who had not been nonjurors before became nonjurors now. The death of King William occurred in March, 1702.

[1] Hore's 'Church in England from William III. to Victoria,' i. 180.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE STUART PERIOD.

*The Church in the Reign of Queen Anne* (1702-1714).

Queen Anne at once shows her Church leanings—Bill against Occasional Conformity—Queen Anne's Bounty—The Marlborough influence as regards Church affairs—'The Memorial of the Church of England,' and the 'Church in danger' cry—Convocation disputes revived—Trial of Dr. Sacheverell—Last four years of Queen Anne—Act for the building of fifty-two new churches—Passing of the Occasional Conformity Act—Bill to prevent Nonconformists from acting as tutors and schoolmasters—Augustan age of Church literature—Notice of chief Church writers in the reign of Queen Anne—Practical work—Paterson's 'Pietas Londinensis' an evidence of the frequent Church services in London—Instances of good parish priests—Advance of the Charity Schools and Parochial Libraries schemes.

WILLIAM III. had never been popular, and his Church policy had been not one of the least causes of his unpopularity. The English, as a body, had almost as strong an objection to being trapped into virtual Presbyterianism under a Dutch Calvinist, as to being delivered over to Rome under a Roman convert. Hence the strong and undisguised predilections of the new Queen for the Church of England found an echo in the general feeling of the nation. She at once showed her leanings by passing over the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Tenison, and selecting the Archbishop of York, Dr. Sharp, to preach her coronation sermon.

Dr. Sharp had deservedly the confidence of the Church and nation; he was a true English Churchman, but not, what was called in the language of the day, a 'high flier.' It was the spiritual rather than the political aspect of the Church that attracted him, and it was a good omen for the future that the Queen took him for her confidential adviser in ecclesiastical affairs; it would have been well if she had always listened to his advice. The commission which William had employed to advise him on Church patronage found no favour with the Queen. 'Her Majesty,' it was said, 'would herself dispose of all ecclesiastical preferments belonging to the Crown as they became vacant, and would not leave it to the Archbishop of Canterbury and five other bishops as the late King had done.'[1] In her speech at the prorogation of Parliament, a few weeks after her accession, while she undertook to maintain the Act of Toleration, she plainly declared that 'her own principles must always keep her entirely firm to the interest and religion of the Church of England, and would incline her to countenance those who had the truest zeal to support it.'

The General Election returned a large number of Tories and High Churchmen—terms which were now, unfortunately, becoming identical; and on November 4, 1702, a measure was brought into the House of Commons which was a crucial test of the feeling of its members on Church affairs. This was a *Bill against Occasional Conformity*—that is, against the practice of receiving the Holy Communion just

[1] Narcissus Luttrell's 'Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September, 1678, to April, 1714,' vol. v., p. 157.

once as a qualification for office required by the Test Act, on which occasion the Queen made no secret of her strong desire that the Bill should pass. It was thrown out in the Lords; reintroduced in November, 1703, but with the same result; introduced once more in November, 1704, but this time tacked on to a land-tax. The object of this adroit but rather discreditable manœuvre was to render the Lords powerless, inasmuch as they had no control over finance. It was equally unfair to exclude men from office because they could not conscientiously communicate, and to force clergymen to administer the Holy Communion to men who avowedly presented themselves only for a political purpose. The true remedy would have been to abolish the Test Act, but it required the experience of more than a hundred years to teach men the expediency of doing this.

Earlier in the same year (February 6, 1703-4), the Queen showed her regard for the Church by announcing to the House of Commons that she had been pleased to remit the arrears of tenths to the poor clergy, and that she would henceforth make a grant of the whole of her revenue from first-fruits and tenths to the augmentation of poor livings. The sum thus given amounted to at least £16,000 a year, and may well be termed *Queen Anne's Bounty*. Strictly speaking, indeed, it might be rightly termed 'Queen Anne's Justice,' for the Crown had no right to the money. The tax originated in the time of the Crusades, when the popes exacted the first-fruits of every living—that is, the whole of the first year's income—and the tenth of every succeeding year, towards the expenses of those expeditions. When

the Crusades came to an end, the tax ought to have come to an end with them; but it did not, being found a convenient contribution to the Papal exchequer. Henry VIII., when he threw off the Papal yoke, calmly appropriated this source of revenue to the use of the Crown; Queen Mary restored it to the Church; but Queen Elizabeth resumed it in the very first year of her reign. Burnet claims the credit of having persuaded Queen Anne to perform this act of bounty or justice, a claim which Lord Dartmouth, Dean Swift, and others will not admit. However, be the impulse which urged on the Queen what it might, the result was not only productive of great benefit to the Church, but also of great popularity to herself. It was spoken of as 'an act unequalled by any prince since the Reformation,'[1] as having 'redeemed our happy Reformation from the only reproach that had been cast upon it,'[2] and so forth. The Queen certainly signalized her birthday—February 6—in a noble way by founding Queen Anne's Bounty.

But these happy auspices for the Church were not fulfilled. Queen Anne was not strong-minded, and was liable to be influenced greatly by her surroundings; the Marlborough influence now began to tell upon her, and the Whigs, who were identified with the Low Churchmen, were regaining their power. In spite of the vigorous exertions of the clergy, the elections of 1705 turned very largely in favour of the Whigs. The Bill against Occasional Conformity was again thrown out. The antagonism between

[1] Atterbury, sermon viii., on 'The Queen's Accession,' March, 1703-4.

[2] White Kennet, 'Case of Impropriations,' etc., p. 356.

the bishops and their clergy was more bitter than ever, as we shall see when we turn to the doings of Convocation. Those who had extolled the Queen as a true nursing-mother of the Church now began to murmur against her.[1] Speeches and sermons were uttered, and pamphlets were published, in this year of excitement, and the sensation reached its height on the publication of an anonymous tract, of which Dr. Drake, a physician, was almost certainly the writer, entitled 'The Memorial of the Church of England.' This famous tract raised in loud tones the cry—which had for some time been uttered less distinctly—of '*The Church in danger.*' 'The Church of England,' says the writer, 'is flourishing on the surface, but there is a hectic feavour lurking in the very bowels of it, which, if not timely cured, will affect all the humours, and at length destroy the very being of it. The sons of sectaries who overturned the Church in the last century remain. The sudden death of the King disappointed and alarmed them; but when they found the Head of the Church inclined not only to forgive but to forget the past, then they began to challenge and provoke the Church as boldly as ever. Moderation was the word, the Passpartout that opened all the place doors between Lizard Point and Berwick-on-Tweed. They grew as moderate and indifferent as a usurer at a discourse of charity.' The writer does not hesitate to advert

[1] 'When she was the Church's daughter,
She acted as her mother taught her;
But now she's mother of the Church,
She's left her daughter in the lurch,'

wrote a Church wit about this period, when Queen Anne was under the influence of the Duchess of Marlborough.

boldly to the supposed change in the Queen herself: 'The Church does not hold the same rank in the esteem and confidence of the Queen that it once did.' He grapples with the argument that the opposition to Occasional Conformity implied persecution of the Dissenters: 'If it be persecution to take away the trade of hocus-pocus and playing fast and loose with the Almighty, then persecution is the very bond and cement of all government. If divers persons were not almost daily persecuted at certain places called Old Bailies, we should neither sleep, walk, nor ride in safety.' He had, of course, a fling at the Whig bishops: 'Lawn sleeves are no sure sign of a Churchman'; and at the Whig Ministry, 'who have forfeited the esteem and affection of the whole body of the Church to make themselves heads of a prick-ear'd faction who refuse to receive 'em as such'; and then, in a more hopeful strain: 'We have still some bishops left who are true sons of the Church, whose reputation is not built upon the sandy bottom of a treacherous moderation, nor their heads vainly filled with chimerical notions of an impracticable comprehension, who, under the general indefinite term of Protestant, have not lost the important distinction between a Church of England man and a fanatic; who are neither to be aw'd by Lambeth, nor wheedled by Sarum, out of their principles, but can construe the Thirty-nine Articles without an exposition,'[1] etc.

It has been thought desirable to quote this pamphlet, which, by its racy, incisive style, was well calculated to arouse the feelings of the multitude, at

[1] This is, of course, a hit at Burnet's 'Exposition of the Articles,' which, as we have seen, had been censured by the Lower House of Convocation, and defended by the Upper.

some length, because it not only produced great excitement at the time, but set the ball a-rolling which did not stop until it had entirely upset the dominant party. Its immediate effects were out of all proportion to its bulk. It was talked of in every coffee-house; it provoked innumerable replies; the grand jury of London and Middlesex ordered it to be burnt as a libel; and there was issued a royal proclamation offering a reward for the discovery of its author. It was especially in allusion to it, though, of course, also to other utterances of a similar character, that in her next speech to Parliament the Queen said: 'Some are so very malicious as to suggest, even in print, that the Church is in danger. I hope none of my subjects can entertain a doubt of my affection to the Church, or suspect it will not be my chief care to support it and leave it secure after me.'

Towards the close of the year (1705) the House of Lords solemnly discussed the question, 'Is the Church in danger, or is it not?' and passed by a majority of nearly two to one a vote that 'the Church of England, which was rescued from the extremest danger by King William, is now, by God's blessing, in a most safe and flourishing condition; and whosoever goes about to insinuate that the Church is in danger under the Queen's administration, is an enemy to the Queen, the Church, and the kingdom.' The Commons sustained the resolution, and the Queen issued a proclamation ordering 'all judges, etc., to apprehend, prosecute, and punish such as falsely, seditiously, and maliciously suggest that the Church is in danger.'[1]

[1] See, *inter alia*, Burnet's 'Own Times,' bk. vii., vol. iv., pp. 128-130.

The 'Church in danger' cry added another element of dissension in Convocation. The Upper House drew up an address to the Crown; but the Lower declined to concur in the address, thinking that, in spite of the assurances of Queen, Lords, and Commons to the contrary, the Church *was* in danger; it claimed the right of presenting its own address, and also of sitting when the Upper House was not sitting; and at last, on February 25, 1705-6, the Queen wrote to the Archbishop, intimating that, in consequence of the dissensions, Convocation should be prorogued. It was an unprecedented thing to prorogue Convocation while Parliament was still sitting, but the Archbishop was glad enough to do so, and the prorogation continued during the whole of the Parliament, to the extreme disgust of the clergy, who carried their grievances with them into the country, and paved the way for the outburst that was soon to occur.

The occasion of that outburst was the determination of the Queen's Ministers to make an example of one of the most violent of the many Churchmen who were spreading an alarm throughout the country of the danger of the Church. The victim selected was Dr. Henry Sacheverell, a Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, who in 1705 was appointed preacher at S. Saviour's, Southwark. On August 14, 1709, he preached an assize sermon at Derby, which caused a great sensation by its strongly-expressed High Church sentiments; and on November 5, 1709, a still more inflammatory sermon before the Lord Mayor on the suggestive text, 'In perils among false brethren' (2 Cor. xi. 26). The Ministry determined to 'impeach Sacheverell at the bar of the Lords in the name of

all the Commons of England,'[1] and thereby brought about their own downfall. It was the very opportunity which the High Church party had long desired for making a demonstration. The Doctor went in a kind of triumphal procession day by day 'to Westminster Hall through the streets from the Temple, in a chariot with large glasses, attended by coaches full of his abettors. Clergymen and others thrust their heads out of the coaches, fawned upon the mob, and bowed to them to encourage their tumults.' The mob cried, 'God save the Church and the Doctor!' assaulted Mr. Burgess's meeting-house, and talked of pulling down the church and house of Mr. Hoadly, who was already one of the Low Church champions. The Doctor was prayed for in several churches as 'one suffering for the cause of the Church.' Some of the Queen's chaplains rallied round him; the Queen herself attended the trial, and as she drove through the streets was greeted with the cry, 'God bless your Majesty! We hope your Majesty is for High Church and Sacheverell!' The Doctor was found guilty by a bare majority of six, and was merely ordered to abstain from preaching for three years. This was regarded as tantamount to an acquittal, and the enthusiasm was intense. There were riots in the capital and in many of the principal towns. The mobs relieved their feelings by burning Hoadly in effigy. Forty thousand copies of the memorable sermon were sold, a living in North Wales was conferred upon the popular Doctor, and he made a triumphal progress, raising enthusiasm all along the course, to visit it; finally, the Queen gave him the rich living of S. Andrew's,

[1] See 'The Compleat History of the Affair of Dr. Sacheverell.'

Holborn, but wisely declined to make him a Bishop. The trial of Dr. Sacheverell not only resulted in the complete triumph of the High Church over the Low Church party, but gave a colour to ecclesiastical politics for more than half a century. Those who 'roasted the parson' burnt their fingers in the flame; and not only did the burnt child, but his children and his children's children, dread the fire.

There is no doubt that the result of this strange episode harmonized well with the Queen's own feelings. She had already shown that the Marlborough influence was not paramount with her—at least, in ecclesiastical affairs. In the winter of 1707-8 she had, at the instigation of Archbishop Sharp, made two appointments which caused great indignation among the Low Church party: that of Dr. Offspring Blackall, who was an antagonist of Hoadly, to the bishopric of Exeter, and that of Sir William Dawes to the see of Chester. Both were pious High Churchmen of the spiritual rather than the political type; otherwise Archbishop Sharp would not have recommended them.[1] He had, indeed, so high an opinion of Sir W. Dawes, that on his death-bed, in 1713, he begged that Dawes might be appointed his successor at York. The Queen had also striven, though in vain, to secure, a little before, the appointment of the High Church candidate, Dr. Smalridge, to the chair of Divinity at Oxford, to which Dr. Potter was appointed.

[1] For instance, Dean Swift was a most able and effective supporter of the political High Churchmen; but Archbishop Sharp persistently opposed all attempts to raise him to the Bench, and his unbounded influence with the Queen enabled him to succeed. Hence Swift stigmatized the two as

'A crazy prelate and a r——l prude.'

During the last four years of Queen Anne's reign the Church was at the height of her influence and popularity. She used the splendid opportunities which were presented to her in some respects, though not in all, well. One of the first measures of the new Parliament, which met in 1710, was to pass, on the strong representation of both Houses of Convocation, and with the cordial approval of the Queen, an Act for the building of fifty-two new churches within the bills of mortality. The noble sum of £350,000 was voted for the purpose, and the money was to be raised by a duty of one shilling on every chaldron of coals that entered the port of London for three years. It will be remembered that a similar course was taken to provide for the rebuilding of S. Paul's, which was completed in this year, and of many parish churches in London after the Great Fire, three shillings a chaldron being the duty then assigned. The Bill passed the Commons without a division; a commission was formed, and the work went on prosperously during the Queen's reign. But, alas! it was never completed. Of the fifty-two churches, only twelve were built, and three or four others repaired; like many other good works, it languished in the Georgian era, and was quietly suffered to drop altogether; but on the twelve that were built a lavish amount of money was spent.

A striking instance of the revived influence of the Church party was the passing, in 1711, with the greatest ease in both Houses of Parliament, of the Bill against Occasional Conformity, which had so often been attempted in vain. That the practice of Occasional Conformity was radically bad for all parties concerned may readily be admitted, and so

far the change of the law was desirable; but so long as the Test Act was in force, the measure bore hardly upon those who could not conscientiously conform to the Church, depriving them of their just rights as citizens.

But a still greater act of injustice to such persons was perpetrated in the last year of the Queen's reign. On May 12, 1714, a Bill was introduced into the House of Commons to the effect that 'no person in Great Britain should keep a public or private school, or act as tutor, that had not first subscribed the declaration to conform to the Church of England, and obtained a license from the diocesan; that upon failing to do so the party might be committed to prison without trial; and that no such license should be granted before the party produced a certificate of his having received the Sacrament according to the Communion of the Church of England within the last year, and also subscribed to the oaths of allegiance and supremacy.'

The whole of Queen Anne's reign was a period of great activity, both literary and practical, which is apt to be lost sight of amid all the political turmoil in which the Church was unfortunately and inextricably mixed up. The expression, 'the Augustan Age of English Literature,' is quite as applicable to the theological as to the secular writings of the period, and exactly expresses its weakness as well as its strength. The Church writers were not the equals of the great Caroline divines in point of grasp and originality of thought, but they were more popular and exercised a wider influence. It is a great drop, say, from the sermons of Isaac Barrow to those of Francis Atterbury; nor can we quite

find the parallel of such writers as Jeremy Taylor, John Pearson, Brian Walton, Robert Sanderson, John Cosin, John Bramhall, and others; but if there were not so many theologians of the first rank in the Queen Anne period, yet those who were most industrious and useful labourers in this important department of Church work were far more numerous than in the earlier period. Joseph Bingham, amid cruel difficulties from the *res angusta domi*, wrote a great part of his masterpiece, 'Origines Ecclesiasticæ; or, The Antiquities of the Christian Church'; William Wall his exhaustive 'History of Infant Baptism'; Humphrey Prideaux his valuable 'Connection of Sacred and Profane History'; John Johnson, of Cranbrook, his 'Clergyman's Vade Mecum,' and a great part of his 'Unbloody Sacrifice,' during the period. Many of the nonjurors profitably employed their enforced leisure in rendering valuable service to the Church in this way. Charles Leslie's very able pen was busy all through the time; so was that of the good and learned, if somewhat eccentric, Henry Dodwell, and of George Hickes, a man of wide and varied accomplishments, and of Jeremy Collier, and of Nathaniel Spinckes, and of Thomas Brett.[1] But the most popular of all the writers among the nonjurors was Robert Nelson, whose 'Companion to the Festivals and Fasts of the Church,' first published in 1704, still remains a standard work on the subject. Ten thousand copies

[1] Brett, however, did not become a nonjuror until the accession of George I. He had no scruple about taking the oaths until after the Sacheverell trial, when he resolved never to take them again. He was, of course, not called upon to do so as long as Queen Anne lived.

of it were printed in four and a half years, and it reached its thirty-sixth edition in 1826. In 1713 Nelson published a model of biography in his 'Life of Bishop Bull,' his old tutor and friend, and several other works, which were of great value and produced a great impression in their day, during the same reign. Some of the great writers of an earlier time lived into this period, such as Robert South, William Cave, Simon Patrick, William Beveridge, and Thomas Ken; while the sermons of Archbishop Sharp, preached for the most part in Queen Anne's reign, still remain as patterns of what plain, practical sermons ought to be. The list, of course, could be largely extended; but enough has been said to show how very active a period it was in theological literature.

Nor was it less active in practical work. Paterson's 'Pietas Londinensis,' published in 1714, gives us an account of the number of services in the London churches, and of the attendance at them, which would astonish those who look upon the whole of the eighteenth century as a dead time in the Church. The attendance at these very numerous services was largely fed, and the necessary expenses of them frequently discharged, by the religious societies, which at this time reached the zenith of their fame and usefulness. The schemes for doing good projected, and to a great extent carried out, by Robert Nelson anticipated many of those which have been started in our own generation. We have also many indications of active Church work going on in all parts of the country. My own predecessor, Samuel Wesley, was labouring, with the assistance of his incomparable wife, at Epworth all through the

reign of Queen Anne; so was Isaac Milles, a sort of George Herbert without his poetry, at Highclere; so was William Burkitt at Dedham (during the earlier part of the time); so was John Johnson at Cranbrook. These were all admirable parish priests, whose labours have been rescued from oblivion by the fact that Lives or Memoirs have been written of the labourers. But we learn from incidental notices that there were very many others labouring in the same way throughout the country. The diary of Ralph Thoresby, which gives us a most valuable insight into religious life in the time of Queen Anne, conveys a favourable impression of the work done by the Church in the country; it tells us, amongst others, of a Mr. Plaxton, Vicar of Woodside, near Leeds, who was 'very commendably serious and industrious in his cure, and brought his parish into excellent order.' Dr. Marsh, Vicar of Newcastle-on-Tyne, is described in the 'Life of Ambrose Barnes' as 'a person of great worth and excellency, and so famous a casuist that he was resorted to as "a common oracle" by all the neighbourhood.' Mr. Cock, Vicar of S. Oswald's, Durham, was 'unwearied in his labours as a parish priest.'[1] And so one might go on *da capo*.

The various societies which had been founded by Dr. Bray and others in the preceding reign throve most vigorously during the reign of Queen Anne. The *Charity Schools* increased so rapidly that in 1712 there were no less than 117 such schools in London and Westminster, and 500 in other parts of the country; whilst the *Parochial Libraries* scheme of Dr. Bray became so important that in 1709 a Bill

[1] A short life of this good man was written by Dr. Hickes.

was passed in Parliament 'for the better preserving of parochial libraries.' The very essential work of establishing a colonial episcopate was agitated, and 'the Church seemed on the point of attaining the object at which she had so long aimed; but the Queen's death put an end to the arrangement.'[1]

It is a temptation to linger fondly on the good work done by the Church at this period, when one remembers the sad change which was so soon to follow; but the temptation must be resisted. Enough has been said to show that the days of 'good Queen Anne' were palmy days for that National Church which she loved.

[1] Hawkins' 'Historical Notices of the Missions of the Church of England in the North American Colonies,' p. 144.

# CHAPTER IX.

## THE GEORGIAN ERA.

*The Church in the Reigns of George I. and George II.* (1714-1760).

Change from activity to lethargy—Instances of the change—Causes of it: (1) Recrudescence of nonjuring disputes—(2) Personal characters of George I. and George II.—(3) Influence of Sir R. Walpole, illustrated in the case of Dean Berkeley—(4) The silencing of Convocation—(5) The prevalence of controversy—Shows also strength of the Church—The Deistic Controversy—The Trinitarian—The Bangorian—Church won all along the line—But lost as a moral and spiritual power—William Law—John Wesley: his early life—'The Oxford Methodists'—Wesley's mission to Georgia—Moravian influence—Difficulties of the Church in dealing with Methodism—The later nonjurors—Their services to Church literature—Trial and banishment of Bishop Atterbury—William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury—His scheme of reunion—Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London—Thomas Wilson, Bishop of Sodor and Man—Other bishops of the period—Growth of toleration—Acts of Parliament affecting the Church.

THE rapid change from activity to lethargy which commenced with the accession of George I. is one of the most remarkable phenomena in the history of the English Church. The causes of this change are not far to seek; but, before indicating them, it will be well to give one or two instances of the fact. Before the death of Queen Anne there seemed every prospect of the appointment of colonial and missionary bishops, the lack of whom became for nearly

a hundred years the scandal and disgrace of the Church. Upon the presentation of a memorial to the Queen by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, in 1709, on the subject, Archbishop Sharp, in conjunction with the Bishops of Bristol (Robinson) and S. David's (Bull), and with Drs. Smalridge, Stanhope, and Atterbury, prepared a scheme to be submitted to Convocation 'concerning bishops being provided for the plantations.' The absence of the Bishop of London, who was *ex officio* head of the Colonial Church, delayed the scheme; but in 1713 the same society presented another memorial to the Queen, which was very favourably received. In the following year, however, the Queen died, and another application of the society to her successor, on January 3, 1715, for the erection of four bishoprics at Jamaica, Barbados, Burlington, and Williamsburg, led to no result. Political causes intervened, and, through no fault of the society, nor of the Church generally, which still persisted in pressing the point, the scheme was quietly dropped. The noble project for the building of fifty-two new churches within the bills of mortality was being carried out most successfully, not to say lavishly, until the death of the Queen, and then—it was quietly dropped. The religious societies had been prospering and extending their influence more and more widely from their foundation, in 1678, till the death of the Queen; then they began to languish, were suspected of political designs, dragged on a feeble existence for some years, and then—quietly dropped.[1] The large

[1] They struggled on, however, for many years. Secker preached one of his admirably sensible sermons 'in the Church of St. Mary le Bone,' December 4, 1754, at the yearly meeting

number of Church services, both Sunday and week-day, which are specified by Paterson as existing in London,[1] and, by other writers, elsewhere, grew small by degrees and beautifully less, till at last all but the barest minimum—were quietly dropped. Convocation, after a stormy existence for the first three years of the new reign, was, so far as its active functions went—quietly dropped.

This last, however, was not only a symptom, but one of the many causes which led to that spiritual lethargy which has made the Georgian era a reproach to our Church; and to these causes we must now refer.

1. The nonjuring dispute entered upon a new phase. By some peculiar mental process which it is impossible to explain, men who scouted the notion that the son of James II. was a supposititious child had certainly come to persuade themselves that they were not violating the doctrine of hereditary right in yielding loyal obedience to Queen Anne. During her reign the Jacobite question seems to have fallen, by tacit consent, into abeyance. If she was not the rose, she was so very near the rose that she might decently be accepted as the real article. But now the clergy who had been the most ardent advocates of the Divine, hereditary, indefeasible right were called upon to accept a Sovereign who had no pretension whatever to such a right. They were placed in an utterly false position; they were Hanoverians by office, but Jacobites at heart, and the mere fact

---

of the Religious Societies. See Secker's Works, ed. by Hughes, vol. iii., sermon cxxxvi.

[1] See Paterson's 'Pietas Londinensis' (1714).

of this anomaly tended greatly to cripple their energies and impair their usefulness.

2. The personal characters of the first two Georges helped to lower the standard of that Church of which they were the temporal governors. They had the vices of the Stuarts, without their refinement and culture; they did not understand our language, our customs—least of all, our Church system. George I., so far as he was anything, was a German Lutheran; neither he nor his successor had the slightest sympathy with those principles which fascinated and influenced Anne, and, to a less extent, her elder sister, Mary. The Court gave no encouragement whatever to Church teaching and Church work, and the Court was a power to be reckoned with far more than it is now.

3. The policy of the all-powerful Minister, who, through almost the whole of George I.'s reign, and the greater part of his son's, ruled everything in Church and State, was fatal to the Church, if beneficial to the State. Sir Robert Walpole had learnt to apply his favourite maxim, 'Quieta non movere,' to the affairs of the Church before he began to apply it to those of the State. 'In 1710,' writes his first biographer, 'Walpole was appointed one of the managers for the impeachment of Sacheverell, and principally conducted that business in the House of Commons. The mischievous consequences of that trial had a permanent effect on the future conduct of Walpole when head of the Administration. It infused into him an aversion and horror at any interposition in the affairs of the Church.'[1] If this aversion had led him merely to step aside, and leave the Church

[1] Coxe's 'Memoirs of Sir R. Walpole,' vol. i., pp. 24, 25.

to manage her own affairs, no harm would have been done. But this was just what he did not do. He seems to have considered that his part was to throw cold water upon every attempt to make the Church a reality as a spiritual influence. 'Quieta non movere' meant, so far as the Church was concerned, 'Surtout, point de zèle'; and, worst of all, he so inculcated his maxim upon others that it took too deep a root in the heart of the nation to fall with his fall. One instance out of many may be given. Dean (afterwards Bishop) Berkeley, filled with the missionary spirit, went forth to Bermuda to found a college for the education of the planters' children, and 'of young savages who might be trained as missionaries' to spread the Gospel among the native races. In 1725 he obtained a charter for the proposed college, and a vote from the House of Commons asking the King to make a grant of £20,000 for the same purpose. He also, by his personal exertions, obtained voluntary subscriptions to the amount of £5,000, and went out to America full of hope. He waited and waited in vain for the promised grant; till at last, in 1731, Walpole, on being importuned by Bishop Gibson for a fulfilment of the promise, calmly replied that, 'if consulted as a Minister, he should reply that the money should most undoubtedly be paid as soon as it suited public convenience; but that, if consulted as a friend, he advised Berkeley by all means not to wait in hopes of his £20,000.' Of course the benevolent project fell through.

4. The silencing of Convocation. It is hardly necessary to dwell upon the fact that to deprive the Church of even discussing, not to say managing, its own affairs in its own constitutional way—a privilege

which was enjoyed by every sect in the land—must have necessarily tended to impair its usefulness, and, to a great extent, render it powerless for good. And there really was no fair pretext at the time for such an act of tyranny and injustice. Earlier in the century, when the disputes between the Upper and the Lower Houses were raging, it might perhaps have been plausibly argued that it was desirable, in the interests of the Church itself, to suppress—at least, for a time—so turbulent an element. But it was not so much so in 1717. On the contrary, indications had been given of a sincere desire to do good, practical work for the Church and nation. Among the agenda of the Convocation which met, along with Parliament, on March 17, 1715, are found the following most useful subjects for consideration: The regulation of the proceedings in excommunication and commutation of penances; of the terriers of glebes, etc.; of the licenses for matrimony; of the prevention of clandestine marriages; the preparing a form for consecrating churches; the qualifications of candidates for Holy Orders; the making more effectual the seventy-fifth canon, which relates to the sober conversation required in ministering; the forty-seventh canon, which provides for curates where ministers are lawfully absent from their benefices; the forty-eighth, which refers to the licensing of such curates; and the sixty-first, for better preparing young persons for Confirmation, and for more orderly performance of that office. What could be more practical and more sensible? Convocation was not suspected of disloyalty. On April 7 the two Houses presented a joint address to the King, who replied: 'I thank you for your very dutiful and loyal

address. You may be assured I will always support and defend the Church of England as by law established, and make it my particular care to encourage the clergy.' How he fulfilled his promise will now appear.

As early as 1705, Benjamin Hoadly, the Rector of S. Swithin's and S. Peter-le-Poor, had been censured by the Lower House of Convocation for a sermon preached before the Lord Mayor at S. Lawrence, Jewry. He had then had a fierce controversy with Atterbury, for some time Prolocutor of the Lower House, on the subject of passive obedience. Queen Anne had been in vain recommended by the House of Commons to prefer him; but George I. at once made him his chaplain, and Bishop of Bangor. In 1716, in reply to some posthumous papers of Dr. Hickes on 'The Constitution of the Catholic Church, and the Nature and Consequences of Schism,' he wrote, in defence of the Government, which was supposed to have been assailed by Dean Hickes, a work entitled 'A Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Nonjurors both in Church and State; or, An Appeal to the Consciences and Common-sense of the Christian Laity'; and on March 31, 1717, he preached before the King, in the Chapel Royal at S. James's, a sermon on the 'Nature of the Kingdom or the Church of Christ,' from the text, 'My kingdom is not of this world' (S. John xviii. 36), which was published. Now, if Convocation was to take notice of *any* works, it could hardly let these two pass unnoticed. In the 'Preservative,' 'a Christian Bishop practically denied the necessity of communion with any visible Church, and contended that nothing was required of a Christian but sincerity;

in the sermon he maintained that Christ never intended to found such a visible Church as the Church of England, and impugned all tests of orthodoxy and all ecclesiastical government.'[1] The Lower House drew up a long 'Representation' about the Bishop of Bangor's sermon of the 'Kingdom of Christ'; but before it could be even presented to the Upper, the Ministry ordered the prorogation of Convocation. It was prorogued on November 23, 1717, and never again allowed to meet for the despatch of business for 135 years.[2]

5. The prevalence of controversy. The Socinian Controversy, the Nonjuring Controversy, the Bangorian Controversy, the Deistical Controversy, unsettled men's minds, and hindered the work of the Church in more ways than one. They diverted both bishops and clergy from the proper duties of their office to the very necessary task of answering op-

[1] Mr. Hore ('The Church in England from William III. to Victoria,' i. 320, 321) thus sums up Bishop Hoadley's position, and after carefully reading both the 'Preservative' and the sermon, I feel that I cannot do better than borrow his summary.

[2] Canon Joyce takes a different view. 'It is not fair,' he writes, 'to blame the Civil Power for silencing Convocation. Whenever Parliament has been summoned by the Crown, concurrent synods in both provinces have been summoned at the same time' ('England's Sacred Synods,' p. 736). This is true enough in the letter, but the summons was regarded as a mere form, and those who are intimately acquainted with the mind of the eighteenth century must be perfectly aware that Convocations would never have been allowed then to meet for the despatch of serious business. Archbishop Secker, in his admirable 'Oratio Synodalis' of 1761, distinctly implies that it would not have been allowed, 'quandocunque concessa fuerit aliquid agendi facultas, hoc vero' [that is, the power of doing serious business] 'nostrâ culpâ non obtigisse toto pectore lætabimur' (clearly throwing the blame on the State). Secker's Works, vol. v., pp. 218, 229, new ed., 1792.

ponents; and some of them suggested doubts which troubled earnest men, and which offered a very convenient excuse for others, who had no desire to be bound down by the restraints of Christianity, to neglect its rules.

But this last reason suggests what was undoubtedly the strong as well as the weak point of the Church in the early Georgian era. While we fully admit its shortcomings, we should, in common gratitude, remember that it is to this period that we owe some of the very ablest and most exhaustive defences of Christian truth that exist in our language. The Church more than held her own in the various controversies of the time, and the writings of her apologists are the one bright spot—and a very bright spot it is—in a somewhat gloomy picture. It is impossible to take the various controversies in chronological order, because they overlapped one another, and it is difficult to specify precisely when each began and ended; but let us begin with that which was certainly the noisiest, and perhaps also the most important—the Deistic Controversy.

Deism is a vague term, but, broadly speaking, it may be taken to mean an acceptance of religion, and even of the Christian religion, without the acceptance of revealed truth as found in Holy Scripture—in other words, the exaltation of natural, at the expense of revealed, religion. This at least will express with sufficient accuracy the general tendency of those who are called the Deistical writers in England. The first who properly comes under that designation[1] is

[1] Lord Herbert of Cherbury, who is classed by Leland and others among the Deists, appears to me scarcely to come under that designation.

John Toland, who published, in 1696, a short and incomplete treatise, entitled 'Christianity not Mysterious; or, A Discourse showing that there is nothing in the Gospel contrary to Reason nor above it, and that no Christian Doctrine can properly be called a Mystery.' The book was, as we have seen, censured by the Lower House of Convocation, and was preached against on all sides; but it elicited no answer of classical fame—perhaps it was hardly worth one. Next came another short treatise, entitled 'A Discourse of Freethinking, occasioned by the Rise and Growth of a Sect called Freethinkers,' which first appeared anonymously in 1713, but was soon known to be the work of Anthony Collins, a country gentleman, and a disciple of John Locke. Collins published, both before and after, other works of a similar character; but the 'Discourse of Freethinking' is that by which he is best known. Like Toland's book, it attracted attention out of all proportion to its intrinsic merits; and the writer had the honour of drawing out the greatest of English scholars and critics, Richard Bentley, who simply pulverized Collins in his 'Remarks on a Discourse of Freethinking, by Phileleutherus Lipsiensis.' It was not a difficult task, for Collins was a mere amateur, and Bentley was a highly-trained professional. It was rather like breaking a butterfly upon a wheel; but we have to thank Mr. Collins for having elicited one of the most brilliant and effective pieces of criticism from the Christian side in the English language. Dean Swift also wrote against Collins one of the most powerful of his many powerful tracts. In 1714, Lord Shaftesbury's 'Characteristics of Men and Manners' appeared as a single work

about the same time as Collins' book, and is, of course, a work of a far higher calibre; but though it contains a covert and very bitter attack upon revealed religion, it can only be termed indirectly a part of the Deistical literature. The next book was a direct outcome of Collins' work—viz., 'Six Discourses on the Miracles,' by William Woolston, who ridicules the literal interpretation of the New Testament miracles with the coarsest blasphemy, and substitutes in its place interpretations which read like the disordered fancies of a sick man's dream. This, in fact, represents the state of the case, for Woolston was of unsound mind, and one is surprised that he should have been taken seriously. He, however, drew out another masterpiece on the Christian side—viz., Thomas Sherlock's 'Tryal of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus.' The next Deistical work was by far the most famous and most powerful of any that appeared. This was Matthew Tindal's 'Christianity as Old as the Creation.' Tindal was a far more cultured man than Collins or Toland or Woolston, and was universally regarded as the chief exponent of Deism.[1] He, too, drew forth two masterpieces from the defenders of Christianity. Out of no less than 115 answers, the two most

[1] Warburton, *e.g.*, implies in the true Warburtonian language that Tindal's work reached the zenith, and Chubb's the nadir, of Deism; for he informs his friend Hurd that he is going to annihilate them all 'from the mighty author of "Christianity as Old as the Creation" to the drunken, blaspheming cobbler who wrote against Jesus and the Resurrection.' Chubb, by the way, was *not* a cobbler; but that is a detail. Skelton, in his 'Deism Revealed' (1748), says that 'Tindal is the great apostle of Deism, who has gathered together the whole strength of the party, and his book is become the Bible of all Deistical readers.'

notable were Bishop Conybeare's 'Defence of Revealed Religion against "Christianity as Old as the Creation,"' and William Law's 'Case of Reason against Religion.' Conybeare avoids all the scurrility and personality which mar too many of the works written on both sides, and discusses, in calm and dignified, but at the same time luminous and impressive, language, the important question which Tindal had raised. Law's 'Case of Reason Against Religion' is thought by some to be the ablest of the works of that very able writer. That is not my opinion; but, like everything else which Law wrote, it touches the point exactly, and is powerfully worked out. Bishop Butler's 'Analogy' also deals with the arguments of Tindal more than those of any other writer; but it embraces the whole range of the Deistical Controversy, and will therefore be considered separately. Tindal's work was taken up by far feebler hands. Dr. Morgan, in a work entitled 'The Moral Philosopher; or, A Dialogue between Philalethes, a Christian Deist, and Theophanes, a Christian Jew,' follows closely in his footsteps, but is more outspoken in his belief than any of his predecessors. Then came Thomas Chubb, who also follows closely in the wake of Tindal. 'An Inquiry into the Ground and Foundation of the Christian Religion,' 'The True Gospel of Jesus Christ Asserted,' and 'The True Gospel of Jesus Christ Vindicated,' are the titles of the works in which Chubb gives an exposition of his views. He was an illiterate man, but wrote in a clear, vigorous style, suited to the lower and lower-middle classes to whom he especially addressed himself, and was very abusive of the clergy. That remarkable work, 'Christianity not Founded upon

Argument,' by Dodwell the younger, though it played into the Deists' hands by practically reducing faith to an absurdity, can hardly be termed part of the Deistical literature; neither can the lengthy and rather pretentious philosophical works of Lord Bolingbroke—his 'Letters on the Study of History' and his 'First Philosophy.' Both are interesting, as showing how far Deism had drifted away from its old moorings. In the words of Bolingbroke's biographer, 'his "First Philosophy" consisted of nothing more than the residuum which remained after rejecting every opinion, the holding which would embarrass a sceptic arguing with a Christian.'[1] And other writers, such as Peter Annet, Conyers Middleton, Bernard Mandeville, and even David Hume, who are sometimes classified among the Deists, really occupied different ground, and therefore need not detain us now. About the middle of the century, the great controversy died a natural death; but it produced some other works on the Christian side, in addition to those already mentioned, which posterity will not easily let die.

First among them is the immortal work of Bishop Butler—'The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature.'[2] Published in the year 1736, when the excitement raised by 'Christianity as Old as the Creation' was at its height, it hardly omits a single argument which the Deists had used, and anticipates every objection

[1] Cooke's 'Memoirs of Lord Bolingbroke,' vol. ii., p. 152.

[2] It is important to notice the full title, because the 'Analogy' is sometimes spoken of as an analogy between natural and revealed religion. This would destroy the whole point of the argument.

which could be raised. To do any justice to this great work—the greatest, certainly, which appeared in the eighteenth century—it must be read in the light of the Deism which was then prevalent, for Butler's mind was positively steeped in Deistical literature. If this had been borne in mind, we should never have heard the objection that Butler raised more doubts than he solved; for the doubts were already raised, and Butler did more than any man to solve them.

A far more voluminous and pretentious, but really less valuable, work, Warburton's 'Divine Legation of Moses,' was a direct outcome of the Deistic Controversy; for in the dedication of the first three books to the Freethinkers (a term then used as synonymous with Deists), the writer begins: 'Gentlemen, as the following discourse was written for your use, you have the best right to this address.' The work is a colossal monument of the author's learning and industry; the range of subjects which it embraces is enormous, and those who cannot agree with its conclusions, either on the main argument or on the many collateral points raised, must still admire the vast research and varied knowledge which the author displays. Warburton's theory was novel and startling, and evoked as much criticism and opposition from the orthodox as any of the Deistical writings. Warburton, however, was quite ready to meet combatants from whatever side they might come; and, wielding his bludgeon with a vigorous hand, he dealt his blows, now on the orthodox, now on the heterodox, with impartial and unsparing force.

The last work of enduring interest on the Deistic Controversy that need be noticed is Bishop Berkeley's

'Alciphron; or, The Minute Philosopher.' The elegance and easiness of the style, and the freshness and beauty of the descriptions of natural scenery by which the tedium of the controversy is relieved, render this not only a readable, but a fascinating book; but Berkeley falls into the usual error of men who write on controversial subjects in the dialogistic form. He makes his adversaries state their case much more weakly than they would really have done; the giants he raises, only to knock down, are weak-kneed giants. Certainly the same may be said of Tindal, the chief of the Deists; but faults on one side do not justify similar faults on the other.

Never did a cause so completely collapse as that of the Deists; and no wonder, for never was there a controversy in which the preponderance of learning and ability was so overwhelmingly on one side. The Deists would have been entirely forgotten had not the Christian advocates embalmed their names in works which stand in the very first rank of theological literature. The attack upon Christianity had henceforth to take a different form from that which maintained that natural religion was sufficient to make men believe in the God of the Christian, that a revelation was unnecessary in theory, and that *the* revelation in Holy Scripture was spurious and absurd.

The *Trinitarian Controversy* had in one sense reached its height before the Georgian period commenced; but that period was some years old before the great champion of the orthodox faith had driven the adversaries into their final resort of bare Unitarianism, or, rather, Humanitarianism. It is somewhat curious that, after an abeyance of ten centuries, the old question, 'What think ye of

Christ?'—the question which, above all others, troubled the Church during the first six or seven centuries—should have revived in the seventeenth. It took the form of Socinianism, which differed from the old Arianism, in asserting that Jesus Christ had no pre-existence before He was born of the Virgin Mary. The first great work on the Christian side in England was Bishop Bull's 'Defensio Fidei Nicænæ,' which appeared in 1685. It dealt simply with the views of the ante-Nicene Fathers, but settled that most important part of the question conclusively. It was supplemented by Bull's two subsequent works, 'Judicium Ecclesiæ Catholicæ,' and 'Primitiva et Apostolica Traditio.' Then some English defenders of the doctrine of the Trinity were 'induced to overstep the boundaries of Scripture proof and historical testimony, and push their inquiries into the dark recesses of metaphysical speculation.'[1] Among these were Dr. W. Sherlock (Dean of S. Paul's), Dr. South, and Dr. Wallis; but Charles Leslie carried on the controversy without laying himself open to imputations of heresy on any side, as the others had done.

The honest but eccentric and heretical William Whiston propounded a theory which he professed to have derived from Eusebius of Nicomedia, differing from what he termed the Athanasian heresy on the one hand, and the Arian on the other. But by far the most formidable antagonist of orthodoxy was Dr. Samuel Clarke, who, in 1712, published his 'Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity,' which was long regarded as a sort of text-book of modern Arianism. Then arose a Christian champion who annihilated those anti-Trinitarians who held a middle ground

[1] Van Mildert, 'Life of Waterland.'

between the Catholic faith and Humanitarianism pure and simple, as completely as Butler and others annihilated Deism. This was Dr. Waterland, who first appeared in the arena in 1719, and routed Dr. Clarke and his friends from one position after another until he left them no ground to stand upon, except that of admitting the full Divinity of Christ, or regarding Him as a mere man. The titles of Waterland's invaluable and deeply interesting works on the subject sufficiently tell their own tale. They are: (1) 'A Vindication of Christ's Divinity,' which he published in 1719, and carried on in his 'Moyer Lectures' in 1720;[1] (2) his 'Case of Arian Subscription Considered'; (3) 'The Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity Asserted.' Dr. Waterland took a comprehensive view of the whole question, and left to posterity not only an effective answer to Dr. Clarke, but a masterly and luminous exposition of a fundamental doctrine of the faith, the equal to which it would be difficult to find in any other author, ancient or modern.

The *Bangorian Controversy* dealt with a subject not less important than those of the Holy Scriptures and the Holy Trinity which had been thoroughly threshed out in the Deistical and the Trinitarian Controversies, viz., the true character and extent of the Church of Christ. It commenced with the famous treatise of Hoadly, Bishop of Bangor, against the nonjurors in 1716, and his sermon on the

[1] The 'Lady Moyer's Lectures' were established in 1719 on purpose to refute the Arians, and were continued annually until 1774, when the lease of the property left by Lady Moyer expired. See Hunt's 'Religious Thought in England,' vol. iii., ch. xii., p. 30, note.

'Nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ' in 1717, which led, as we have seen, to the silencing of Convocation. Hoadly, who was in great favour with the Government, was charged with having used his influence to silence his opponents in this way. He was not the man to sit down quietly under such an imputation; and to show that he was not afraid of submitting his case to argument, he at once wrote a 'Reply to the Representation of Convocation,' in which he denied the charge, met the arguments of the Convocation report, and also those of Dr. Andrew Snape, Provost of Eton and Chaplain to the King, who had already published two pamphlets against the Bishop's views in the 'Preservative' and the sermon. A vast amount of literature appeared on this subject, but, with the exception of Hoadly himself, there was no writer on the anti-Church side who can be compared with those who wrote in defence of the Church; and in spite of the marked favour which the King and his Ministers showed to the Hoadly party, the Church was quite as triumphant in the Bangorian as it was in the Deistical and the Trinitarian Controversies. Its chief defenders were Dr. Snape; Dr. Thomas Sherlock, then Dean of Chichester, afterwards Bishop of London; Dr. Francis Hare, afterwards Bishop of Chichester; and, above all, William Law, whose 'Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor' are perfect masterpieces of brilliant and effective writing, and are perhaps the only results of the controversy which have lived, being read and admired at the present day as widely as they were 150 years ago.[1] Hoadly answered the

[1] They have lately been republished under the auspices of Canon Gore and Mr. Watts, with an interesting Introduction

three former, but wisely left Law alone. The irrepressible Bishop, however, was far from being silenced. He appeared again in print, though this time anonymously, in 1733, in a book entitled, 'A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,' which reduced the Holy Eucharist to a bare commemorative act. He was answered, among others, by his old antagonist, William Law, in a work entitled, 'A Demonstration of the Gross and Fundamental Errors of a late Book, called "A Plain Account," etc.' This was not so popular as Law's former work, because the writer had by this time become tinged with that mysticism which pervaded all his later writings; but it was equally able and equally strong in its Church views. A vast number of other answers to the 'Plain Account' appeared, and it seemed as if the slumbering flames of the Bangorian Controversy were about to be revived; but the spirit of the age was against such a recrudescence.

Meantime, while the Church was triumphing all along the line in the field of argument, she was steadily losing ground as a moral and spiritual force. In every branch of practical work it is painful to contrast her efficiency in the first decade of the

and Preface. A very old admirer of Law may be pardoned for feeling it a shock to see the familiar title 'Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor' supplanted by 'Law's Defence of Church Principles.' But the reason of the change is obvious, and perhaps conclusive. The old title would convey no definite meaning, and would not be in the least attractive to any but a student of the eighteenth-century theology; the new title is intelligible and attractive to all. What the severely logical mind of Law himself would have thought of a title which covers a far wider ground than he ever intended to traverse is another question.

eighteenth century with her inefficiency in the third. She was, to use a happy simile of a writer of our own time,[1] 'like a prince who employs all his time, and strength, and resources in raising fortresses about a territory which he does not carefully govern; or like a landlord who lives but to accumulate muniments of an estate which he neglects to till.' Christianity seemed to have been proved irrefragably, but to have lost its vital power; to have captured the intellect, but to have lost the heart of the nation. This was a state of things that could not possibly last long. If Christianity was accepted as true, it must have its due influence on the life. Everything was ripe for a change. The train was laid; it only wanted the spark to kindle the fire. That spark was supplied by one who had already done yeoman's service in the intellectual field. It is not attributing too much to the influence of the 'Christian Perfection' and the 'Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life' of William Law to say that they first brought about the turn of the tide. They were published in 1726 and 1728 respectively, and the latter work especially is one which no one with any belief in Christianity at all can read without being deeply affected. The peculiarity of Law is that he appeals quite as much to the head as to the heart. People might dislike the 'Serious Call,' and charge it (as they did) with encouraging 'enthusiasm' — that terrible bugbear of the eighteenth century—but they could not despise it.[2] The same power of argument,

[1] Bishop Fitzgerald in 'Aids to Faith.' Essay ii., 'On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity,' § 2.

[2] It was this power of commending himself alike to the head and to the heart which is so remarkable in Law that touched

the same purity and brilliancy of style—nay, the same raciness of humour—which characterized Law's letters to the Bishop of Bangor, characterized also his 'Serious Call.' As a matter of fact, there is scarcely a prominent man connected with the revival of the eighteenth century who does not owe something to Law for his own awakening. But here Law's connection with that revival ceases. Having sounded the alarm, he retired from the fray. The form which the movement took was quite alien from his own temperament, and to a great extent also from his principles. He was still ever ready to use his very formidable pen to write down all opponents of the faith, but he could never have become either a Methodist or an Evangelical.

The true originator, and for many years the life and soul of the movement, was Law's quondam disciple, *John Wesley* (1703-91); and though it must have all the weariness of a twice-told tale, no sketch of Church history in the eighteenth century can be at all complete without an account of his extraordinary career; so the old, old story must be once more repeated.

John Wesley was born at Epworth Rectory, in Lincolnshire, in 1703. His father was Rector of the parish. His early education he owed chiefly to his

Dr. Johnson. 'I became,' Johnson said, 'a sort of lax *talker* against religion, for I did not much *think* against it; and this lasted till I went to Oxford, when I took up Law's "Serious Call to a Holy Life," expecting to find it a dull book (as such books generally are). But I found Law quite an over-match for me, and this was the first occasion of my thinking in earnest.' 'The finest piece of hortatory theology in any language,' 'the best piece of parænetic divinity'—thus he characterizes in his grandiloquent style the 'Serious Call.'

mother, a woman of remarkable piety, good sense, and culture. When he was six years of age, he was all but burnt to death in a fire which destroyed the Rectory, and his providential escape made so deep an impression upon him that he always regarded himself as a 'brand snatched from the burning.' During his school-days at the Charter House, and his undergraduate days at Christ Church, Oxford, the keen edge of his religious home-training was somewhat blunted. This was almost inevitable, especially when schools and colleges were what they were in the second and third decades of the eighteenth century; but he never lost his sense of religion, and when the time for receiving Holy Orders approached, the old impressions returned with all their force, and, but for the sensible advice of his mother, he would have postponed the all-important step until he felt himself more worthy. The Bishop who ordained him (Dr. Potter) gave him a word of counsel which formed one of the keynotes of his after-life: 'If you would do real good, Mr. Wesley, you must not spend your time in contending for or against things of a disputable nature, but in testifying against vice, and in promoting real, essential holiness.' This was one of John Wesley's watchwords through life, and it was always against the grain when he was forced into controversy. In 1726 he was elected Fellow of Lincoln College, a title by which he always made a point of describing himself in his works; and after three terms at college, spent partly in study and partly in tuition, he returned to Epworth, and from the summer of 1727 till the autumn of 1729 acted as his father's curate at Epworth and Wroot. He was then summoned back to Oxford to resume his old

office o Greek lecturer. On his return he found a little society or club formed, of which Charles Wesley, who was then a Westminster student at Christ Church, was the leading spirit. The simple object of the club was to read classics on week-days and divinity on Sundays, and to encourage the members to attend all the means of grace, especially the Holy Communion. It was quite natural that, when John joined the band, he should take the lead; his age, his experience, his University position, his superior learning, and the ascendancy which he had always exercised over his younger brother, made this a matter of course. And so, 'in November, 1729, four young gentlemen of Oxford—Mr. John Wesley, Fellow of Lincoln College; Mr. Charles Wesley, student of Christ Church; Mr. Morgan, commoner of Christ Church; and Mr. Kirkham, of Merton College—began to spend some evenings together in reading chiefly the Greek Testament.' This was the origin of Methodism; these were the first 'Oxford Methodists.' The name 'Methodist' was given in derision by a 'young gentleman of the college' (Christ Church or Merton). The little party increased, till in 1735 there were fourteen of them. One of the number was a poor servitor of Pembroke College, *George Whitefield* (1714-1770) by name, who was introduced by Charles Wesley. They took up practical work among the poor in the city, and among the prisoners in the gaol; they followed most closely the rules of the Church, especially in regard to fasting and to communicating; and it is an instructive comment upon the need of a general revival of spiritual religion that this perfectly inoffensive little band of young men could not attend the highest service of

the Church without running the gauntlet of a jeering rabble principally composed of men who were actually being prepared for the sacred ministry of the Church. Space forbids us to dwell longer upon the Oxford Methodists. So far as John Wesley was concerned, they pass out of our view on the death of the Rector of Epworth (who had been their warm supporter) in 1735.[1]

The next phase in Wesley's life shows that there were exceptions to the rule that practical Christianity had ceased to exercise influence. At the deadest time of the Church, James Edward Oglethorpe had anticipated the noble and self-denying efforts of Howard, the philanthropist, in striving to ameliorate the condition of unfortunate debtors, and to correct the abuses in the conduct of prisons. That he did this from purely Christian motives is evident from the fact that when, in 1732, he had obtained a Royal Charter for the foundation of the colony of Georgia to be a home for the released prisoners, he laid the greatest stress on the religious element. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel helped him, and he persuaded John Wesley to accompany him to Georgia as a missionary of that society; while Charles Wesley also agreed to go in the capacity of

[1] Why has no Oxford resident written the history of the Oxford Methodists? Mr. Tyerman has indeed given us a full and, from his point of view, a fair account. But it is simply impossible for anyone to write satisfactorily on such a subject unless he is (1) a thorough Churchman, and therefore in full sympathy with their views; (2) a man intimately acquainted with the inner life of the University and the whole course of its history. Surely there are some Oxford men in whom both these essential qualifications are combined. Is there no one among them who will undertake the task?

Secretary to the Governor. The plan received the cordial approval of the widowed mother of the brothers, and also of William Law, who was at that time 'a kind of oracle' to them. On his voyage out Wesley met with some fellow-passengers who deeply influenced his after-life. These were some German Moravians who were driven from their own country on account of their religion, and were going to join the new colony. Their humble, pious behaviour, their courage, arising from a simple trust in God, during a storm, their readiness to perform menial offices from which the English shrank, made Wesley feel that he had at last found the true spirit of Christianity; and his further experience of these Moravians in Georgia confirmed this opinion. Wesley, however, was bitterly disappointed in his expectations in other respects; he had gone out in the hope that he should be 'a missioner' to the Indians, and he found that his duty was to act as a parish priest among a people who were far more difficult to deal with than his parishioners at Epworth. By his own account, he must have been singularly injudicious in his treatment of them, and there is no reason to be surprised that the result was an explosion which, in a word, drove him out of Georgia. Still, his mission was not a failure as, from some unguarded expressions of his own, we might be led to believe. We have abundant evidence to show that, like all really earnest men, he left his mark behind him. But he had not yet found his proper sphere of action; that was not on the American, but on the British side of the Atlantic, to which he returned with sorrow of heart in the early part of 1738.

In England he again came under the Moravian influence in a more powerful form than that which had affected him abroad. He was introduced to Peter Böhler, who, though ten years Wesley's junior, was accepted by him as his spiritual father; and on May 24, 1738, in a meeting of a Society in Aldersgate Street, 'I felt,' he says, 'my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death; and then I testified openly to all there what I now first felt in my heart.'

He had now found his mission: it was to bring all he could to the same happy frame of mind as himself; so, after a pilgrimage to Herrnhuth 'to see the place where the Christians live,' he commenced that wonderful career of activity, bodily and mental, which continued for more than half a century. He visited town after town, and village after village, with bewildering rapidity. He roused the careless and indifferent into a sense of their danger; he formed Societies everywhere, which were certainly intended to be handmaids, not enemies, to the Church; following the example of George Whitefield, he overcame his prejudice against field-preaching, and produced by that means almost as powerful an effect as that great orator himself. But Whitefield was simply a preacher; Wesley was still more markedly an organizer, and a born ruler of men. Charles Wesley fully entered into his brother's spirit, and for the first fifteen years was almost as active an itinerant as John himself; while he also lent invaluable aid by the hymns which poured forth with

marvellous fecundity from his pen. Workers of all classes, lay and clerical, gentle and simple, were enlisted in the cause; but it is to John Wesley that the credit belongs of keeping them together. The Methodists met with violent opposition, which lasted during the whole of the period which this chapter embraces; but John Wesley did not know what fear was, and he inspired his followers with his own courage. They were unpopular, partly for the same reason which made the Deists unpopular, because they disturbed the prevailing quiet; partly because they attacked the strongholds of sin and Satan, a course which will always make men unpopular with many in this evil world; partly because they were misunderstood, being suspected of being Papists in disguise, or of being bent on reviving the hated Puritanism of the seventeenth century, or of bringing back the Pretender; partly because they really did produce an unwholesome excitement in many by their burning words. That the motives of Wesley and most of his co-workers were as pure as the motives of poor human nature can be is, to my mind, beyond a doubt; and it seems a thousand pities that the services of such men, who had really no quarrel whatever with the Church of their baptism, but were sincerely desirous of promoting its best interests, could not have been utilized, instead of being suppressed, so far as they *could* be suppressed. But the question is not so simple a one as it seems. Let anyone read impartially the interviews of Wesley with Archbishop Potter, Bishop Benson, and, above all, with Bishop Butler, and he will admit that there was something to be said on both sides. At any rate it will be admitted that the author of 'The

Analogy' was not a man who would knowingly fight against God. Or let him read Samuel Wesley's (the eldest of the three brothers) view of the situation. It is hopeless to strive to compress the subject into the small compass which the scale of this work would allow, and it would be worse than useless to treat it imperfectly. I must, therefore, be content to refer the reader to other histories of the early Methodist movement, which was beyond all comparison the most important movement connected with the Church in the reigns of the first two Georges.

Apart from the Apologists and the Methodists there are few matters which fairly come within the purview of this work, which, it must be remembered, has only to do with the Church of England as a *National* Church. This limitation, strictly speaking, excludes the history of the later nonjurors, who carefully held aloof from, if they did not actually oppose, the national system. It was most unfortunate that it should have been so, for they would have supplied exactly that which was so lamentably wanting in the Church of the period. They represented the Catholic element in the Church; that element which linked it with the pre-Reformation Church, with the Church of the early fathers — in fact, with the Church universal. Their position differed widely from that of those good men who had been uncanonically deprived of their preferments because their consciences forbade them to violate the oaths they had taken to be faithful to James II. The division between the earlier and later nonjurors had taken place before George I. came to the throne. On the death, in 1709, of Bishop Lloyd, who was the last but one of those nonjuring bishops to whom canonical

obedience was held to be due, the survivor, Bishop Ken, having refused the offer of Queen Anne to restore him to his former see, formally recommended obedience to his now like-minded successor, Bishop Hooper, of Bath and Wells. He thereby, as much as in him lay, closed the separation, and nonjurors of the type of Dodwell, Nelson, and Cherry, gladly returned to the communion of the National Church. But his action was strongly disapproved of by nonjurors of a different type, who not only continued, but took measures for perpetuating the separation by procuring the consecration of bishops for their own communion. The accession of George I., of course, intensified their determination to keep up a separate community, and largely widened the breach between themselves and the National Church. The taking of the oaths of allegiance to William and Mary, who, after all, were as near as well could be to the right line of succession, the Queen being the eldest daughter and the King own nephew to their lawful sovereign, was as nothing when compared with the taking of the oaths to a foreigner, a Lutheran, a man to whom there was at least one whole family, besides that of James II., who had a prior claim to the throne. The course which things took must have filled them with a grim sort of satisfaction. 'It was only what was to be expected, that Convocation should be silenced, practical work dropped, Deists and Socinians flourish, and Latitudinarians put in high places.'

But if they could not join in communion with the National Church, they rendered most valuable service to the true interests of that Church by their pens. With the exception of Butler and Waterland—

names which tower far above any others in the field of theological literature—it would be difficult to find the equals of Charles Leslie, William Law, Jeremy Collier, Thomas Brett, George Hickes, Thomas Carte, Nathaniel Spinckes, Thomas Hearne —where shall we stop?—for intellectual activity in the National Church. The delightful 'Collections' of Hearne can hardly, perhaps, be regarded as representative of the attitude of all the nonjurors of the second generation, but they give a wonderfully vivid picture of the minds of some of them. Hearne was soured in spirit, no doubt; but, like the rest of his nonjuring friends, he had much to sour him, and not the least among the causes of his bitterness was the conduct of those professing Churchmen, clerical and lay, who, if they had been true to their convictions, would have joined the nonjuring ranks; for a vast number of Churchmen were really Jacobites at heart.

This was signally illustrated in the evident sympathy which was shown with the most famous of all the Jacobite clergy who did not become nonjurors, Francis Atterbury. He had accepted the Bishopric of Rochester and Deanery of Westminster in 1713, and on the death of Queen Anne had made no secret of his desire that she should be succeeded by her brother; but he submitted to the new régime, and in his place in the House of Lords offered the most persistent and determined opposition to all the measures, especially the ecclesiastical measures, of the new Government. He was regarded by the Jacobite clergy as their ablest and most effective champion; and when, in 1722, the Ministers proceeded against him, the sympathies not only of the clergy, but of the people generally, were with the

Bishop. His enemies had a strong case against him, for he had certainly been in correspondence with the Pretender. But they put themselves in the wrong by the harshness and injudiciousness of the course they took. The Bishop was arrested, brought before the Privy Council, and imprisoned in the Tower. The popular feeling was awakened by the issue of pamphlets against his harsh treatment, by his being publicly prayed for in most of the churches in London and Westminster, and by the circulation of a sensational print, representing the Bishop looking through the bars of his prison, and holding in hand a portrait of Archbishop Laud.[1] Instead of being brought to trial before a court of law, he was proceeded against by a Bill of Pains and Penalties in the House of Commons. This course gave at once to the many friends of Atterbury an occasion for insinuating that his enemies were afraid to submit his cause to the ordinary courts of justice, and to Atterbury himself an opportunity of which he was not slack to avail himself. He declined to plead his cause before the House of Commons, declaring with some dignity that he was 'content with the opportunity (if the Bill went on) to make his defence before another House, of which he had the honour to be a member.' The Bill *did* go on, and, having passed the Commons, went up to the Lords. Atterbury was brought from the Tower, where he had been confined for seven months, to plead his cause. The very fact of the great orator, who had been quite the most famous preacher in the days of good Queen Anne, appearing now as a prisoner, to use that oratory in self-defence, was impressive. He was

[1] Stanhope's 'History of England,' ii. 38.

quite equal to the occasion; his speech was a masterpiece in its way, but it was of no avail with the audience to whom it was addressed. He was condemned by a majority of eighty-three to forty-three, and the severe sentence pronounced against him was that he should be deprived of all his ecclesiastical offices, incapacitated for holding any civil offices, and banished for ever from the realm; and that no British subject should hold any intercourse with him except by the royal permission. All his brother prelates except one—Bishop Gastrell, of Chester—were against him, which gave occasion to his friend, Lord Bathurst, to say that he could only account for their inveterate hatred on the principle of the wild Americans, who fondly hoped to inherit, not only the spoils, but the abilities of him whom they should destroy.[1] Bishop Atterbury carried with him into his exile a vast amount of sympathy, and left behind him a strong odium against his persecutors, especially against the Bench of Bishops who had shown such a lack of *esprit de corps*. It is for this reason that it has been thought necessary to dwell at some length upon his case. That he was guilty of the charges brought against him there is now no doubt; that the people did not really want to 'have that man to reign over them' for whom Atterbury had plotted is equally indisputable. And yet he had the vast majority of the clergy and a large proportion of the laity with him. It is a remarkable instance of the wide diver-

[1] Lord Bathurst might have accounted for it in a much more simple way. The majority of the bishops were Whigs, and were appointed avowedly as defenders of the Hanoverian dynasty. Atterbury was a Tory, and the head and front of his offence was that he desired to upset the Hanoverian dynasty.

gence that existed between the Church rulers, spiritual and temporal, and the ruled, both clerical and lay. It exactly tallies with Addison's story in the *Guardian* a few years before, when, with one of his inimitable touches of humour, he makes the landlord, who is always ready to drink to the Church, though he has no time to go to church himself, declare with conscious pride that there is no Presbyterian in the neighbourhood except the Bishop.

And yet there were certainly some very worthy and distinguished men on the Episcopal Bench in the time of the first two Georges, a few of whom may be noticed.

The elevation of *William Wake* (1657-1737) to the Primacy was one of the earliest ecclesiastical acts of the new Government under George I. He had been ten years Bishop of Lincoln, and, on the death of Tenison, became Archbishop of Canterbury. For years he had been known as a most able writer, and a conscientious, hard-working man. Though a stanch Churchman, he had very wide sympathies. 'No prelate,' writes Mosheim, 'since the Reformation had so extensive a correspondence with the Protestants abroad, and none could have a more friendly one.' Towards Nonconformists at home he had seemed to show a strange change of front; he opposed the persecuting laws against them at the close of Queen Anne's reign, but equally opposed the abolition of those laws at the beginning of King George's reign. There was nothing selfish in the change, for it will be perceived that on each occasion he took the unpopular side. The inconsistency, also, was rather apparent than real; he thought there was no occasion for such laws when the Church was safe under the Queen, but very great

occasion when it was unsafe under her un-Churchlike successor and his un-Churchlike Ministry. The most interesting result of Wake's yearning for unity was a correspondence into which he entered with the leading men in the Gallican Church, which at first really seemed to bid fair for a union between the two Churches. The one obstacle was the admission of the Papal authority, and the Church of France had never been so strong on that point as some of her sister Churches. Wake was first led to indulge in the hope of a possible union by a controversy, some years earlier, with the brightest ornament of the Gallican Church, Bishop Bossuet; and his hopes were raised by the fact that, in 1713, the Papal Bull, 'Unigenitus,' had greatly alienated many Gallicans from the Papacy. But, as the scheme of reunion fell through, it need not be noticed further. Unfortunately, for the last six or seven years of his life, Wake was incapacitated for active work, and the real work of the Primacy fell upon another.

This was *Edmund Gibson* (1669-1748), who was Bishop of Lincoln from 1716 to 1723, and Bishop of London from 1723 until his death in 1748. It may seem a questionable testimony to Gibson's merits that he was Walpole's chief adviser in ecclesiastical matters, for Sir Robert was not the man whom one would have suspected of making a wise choice of advisers in regard to the Church. 'His esteem,' says his first biographer (Archdeacon Coxe), 'for the Bishop of London had been so great that, when he was reproached with giving him the authority of a Pope, he replied: "And a very good Pope he is."' And a very good Pope he was in many respects. He had certainly more than earned his advancement

by his achievements. His 'Codex Juris Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ,' etc., has been rightly described as 'a magnificent monument of research.'[1] His 'Synodus Anglicana; or, The Constitution of an English Convocation' (1702), is still a standard book; and he did most useful work in editing 'A Collection of the Principal Treatises against Popery in the Papal Controversy, etc.' (1738)—that is, the controversy in the reign of James II. As Bishop of London, he showed great moral courage in opposing the prevailing laxity, and no less in acting contrary to the wishes of his great friend Walpole, at the sacrifice of the all-powerful Minister's friendship.[2] He consequently was not appointed to the Primacy on the death of Archbishop Wake, though he was so universally expected to succeed that he was called the 'heir-apparent of Canterbury.' The man who superseded him was John Potter, Bishop of Oxford, who was also a good specimen of the Georgian Prelate, being a good scholar, a good Churchman, and a man of irreproachable character. Gibson's successor in London was Thomas Sherlock, a man of a more original mind than either Gibson or Potter, and more than equal to his position in every way.

*Thomas Wilson* (1663-1755) holds a unique position among the bishops of the eighteenth century. Consecrated to the Episcopate before that century commenced (1697), he ruled his island diocese (which he

[1] See Archdeacon Perry's article on Edmund Gibson in the 'Dictionary of National Biography.'

[2] The offence was his voting and writing against the Quakers' Relief Bill in 1736, which passed the House of Commons by 164 to 48 votes, but was thrown out in the Lords by 54 to 35 through the bishops' votes, fifteen bishops voting against it.

was in vain tempted to exchange for a richer by three monarchs) for more than fifty-seven years, during which he established and maintained a system of strict discipline quite unparalleled in any other part of Great Britain. Under Bishop Wilson, Church censures in the Isle of Man continued a reality long after they had become a *brutum fulmen* elsewhere. Under the same benevolent despotism, Christian education extended and flourished as it never did in England, and parochial libraries were established in every parish in the island. Even when a collision between the civil and ecclesiastical powers occurred, and the Bishop was actually in prison, this made no difference: he declared that he never ruled his diocese better than when he was in gaol, and, but for his health's sake, would have been content to remain there. Of course, the circumstances of the Isle of Man were peculiar; and the system of Bishop Wilson could not have been carried out elsewhere—at any rate, in the eighteenth century. Convocation might be suspended in England, but it continued active in the isle, where the Bishop still assembled his annual synod of clergy, unmoved by what had taken place on the other side of the water. The secret of his influence was simply his own personal character, which commanded universal and unbounded respect. He had no great friends to support him, and, though a man of talents and culture, no commanding genius. His extraordinary career is an instance of what sheer goodness and undaunted moral courage can effect. He stands quite alone among his contemporaries as a primitive Bishop; and it is a comfort to add that, when at last death removed him, a worthy successor was found in Bishop Hildesley.

So far as intellectual qualifications went, the Bench was sure of competent occupants when that very remarkable woman, Caroline of Anspach, Queen of George II., vied with Walpole himself as the dispenser of ecclesiastical patronage.[1] Whether they would be orthodox or not was another question, for the Queen was rather inclined to dabble in heresy; but it is to her that the Church is indebted for some of the best bishops of the time—Sherlock, Smalridge, Secker, Potter, and, above all, Butler, who was unearthed from his retreat at Stanhope, and forced, against his will, to attend the Queen's intellectual evening parties. Caroline did not live long enough to see him raised to the Bench, but she strongly recommended him to the King on her death-bed, and in the following year (1738) that great and good man was appointed to the poor bishopric of Bristol, and in 1750, 'wafted in a cloud of metaphysics' (as Horace Walpole is pleased to express it), to the rich see of Durham. But Butler was not a mere bookworm; besides being incomparably the most distinguished man on the Bench, he was also a working Bishop, and by his life, as well as by his writings, was worthy of the post.

As Butler was the greatest, so perhaps Martin Benson was (next to Bishop Wilson) the most saintly and the most universally beloved of all the bishops of the time. He was Bishop of Gloucester from

[1] John, Lord Hervey, writing to Hoadly, then Bishop of Salisbury, and urging him to come to London and put in a claim for the vacant bishopric of Winchester, says: 'You know the King's two ears; apply to them both!' The two ears were Queen Caroline and Sir R. Walpole. Hervey's 'Memoirs,' ii. 445.

1734 to 1752, and is now best known for his kindness to George Whitefield. John Hough, Bishop of Worcester;[1] Zachary Pearce, Bishop successively of Bangor and of Rochester; Francis Hare, of S. Asaph and then of Chichester; John Conybeare, of Bristol; White Kennet, of Peterborough; Thomas Secker (who will reappear in the next chapter), and others whom it would be tedious to name, had merits, moral or intellectual, or both, to recommend them.

The 'inferior clergy' (to use an odious expression of the time) differed very widely from one another both in social position and in learning and efficiency. In position they ranged from the rich country gentleman, who was a squire of the better sort in all but in name, to the very poor curate, who was hardly better off than the day labourer—in short, from Dr. Primrose at Wakefield to Dr. Primrose at his unnamed curacy, working in the fields with his son Moses from morning till night; in learning, from Parson Adams, the ripe scholar, to Parson Trulliber, who was most at home among his pigs.

But bishops and clergy alike certainly held, as a body, a lower place in the popular esteem than they had done in the preceding generation. The Church was popular, but her ministers were not. Of course such writers as John, Lord Hervey, who 'had a peculiar antipathy to the Church,'[2] Lord Chesterfield, Horace Walpole, and Lady Sundon (Mrs. Clayton) are, for various reasons, not at all to be depended upon in such matters; but, unfortunately, their testimony to the low regard in which the clergy were

[1] The same who fought the gallant battle with James II. on the subject of the Presidentship of Magdalen.

[2] Croker's note to Hervey's 'Memoirs,' i. xxv.

held is fully borne out by very sincere friends of the Church.[1]

Again, among the Church laity—though there were honourable exceptions, such as James Oglethorpe, already mentioned—we certainly do not find laymen taking the prominent part as Church workers that Robert Nelson, John Kyrle, Edward Colston, and many others had done. The best were survivors of an earlier generation, such as William Melmoth (1666-1743), Mary Astell (1668-1731), and the admirable 'Lady Betty Hastings' (1682-1739).

A bright spot in this dark period may be found in the growth of toleration which certainly marked it, and which no true Churchman will regret. George I. sounded the keynote in his speech before his first Privy Council, in which he expressed his love of 'the toleration allowed by law to Protestant Dissenters' as being 'so agreeable to Christian charity, and'—a true eighteenth-century reason—'so necessary to the trade and riches of this great kingdom.' On December 13, 1718, a Bill was introduced by Lord Stanhope in the House of Lords, under the vague title of 'An Act for strengthening the Protestant interests in these kingdoms,' which really meant a repeal of the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts, and of some clauses in the Test and Corporation Acts. But the last two Acts were too sacred to be touched, so the clauses relating to them were withdrawn, and then the Bill passed both Houses.

[1] A large number of testimonies to this effect will be found in the chapter on 'Church Abuses' in Abbey and Overton's 'English Church in the Eighteenth Century,' and additional ones in Mr. Abbey's 'English Church and its Bishops' (1700-1800), ch. iv.

In 1722 the Quakers' Affirmation Bill, whose title tells its own tale, passed; but the attempt to give further relief in the Bill called 'The Quakers' Relief Bill,' in 1736, failed, as we have already seen. In 1753 an Act was passed 'to permit persons professing the Jewish religion to be naturalized,' but it produced such a violent outcry throughout the country that it was repealed in the very next Session. Lord Hardwicke's Act, of the same year, for preventing clandestine marriages, while it was a boon to all respectable clergymen, was a grievous blow to some disreputable ones, especially those known as 'the Fleet parsons'; and finally the 'Act for regulating the commencement of the year and for correcting the calendar' deserves a passing notice, as illustrating the superstitious prejudices that still lingered on in the Church. It was denounced by some as a Popish innovation, because the change was first made by Pope Gregory XIII. in 1582; by others as an Act of profanity, because it moved the time of the immovable Feasts of the Church; by others as an impious shortening of men's lives by eleven days. Evidently the schoolmaster was not abroad in the closing years of George II.

# CHAPTER X.

## THE GEORGIAN PERIOD.

*The Church in the Reign of George III.* (1760-1820).

A new era—Decay of Jacobitism—A better example at Court—Some typical prelates of the period—Thomas Secker—William Warburton—Richard Hurd—William Lowth—Rise of the Evangelical school—Methodism, not a Church movement—Arminian and Calvinistic Methodists—Lady Huntingdon's Connection—The Wesleys and Whitefield start the Evangelical Revival—The Evangelicals proper—James Hervey—William Grimshaw—John Berridge—William Romaine—Henry Venn—John Newton—Thomas Scott—Richard Cecil—Joseph Milner—Isaac Milner—Other Evangelical clergy—The laity—William Cowper—The Clapham Sect—William Wilberforce—John Thornton—Henry Thornton—Zachary Macaulay—James Stephen—Lord Teignmouth—Rectors of Clapham, John Venn and Dr. William Dealtry—Thomas Gisborne—Cambridge, an Evangelical centre—Charles Simeon—Queens' and Magdalene Colleges—William Farish and others—Clerical education societies—Evangelicals in London—Episcopal friends—Royal friends—Parliamentary friends of Evangelicalism—Hannah More—Abolition of slave trade—Evangelical societies, especially Church Missionary Society—Effects of Evangelicalism on the Church—Revived activity not confined to Evangelicals—Rise of Sunday-schools—William Paley—Richard Watson—Earnest and distinguished High Churchmen—Samuel Johnson and Edmund Burke—Samuel Horsley—George Horne—William Jones, of Nayland—William Stevens—Joshua Watson—Henry Handley Norris—Christopher Wordsworth (the elder)—Charles Daubeny—Other adherents of 'the Clapton Sect'—Foundation of the National Society—Of the Indian Episcopate—Of the Church Building Society—Growing efficiency of the Church, and growing odium against it.

THE reigns of the first two Georges resembled one another so closely, as far as the Church was concerned, that it was convenient to treat of them in one chapter. But a new era, in many respects, set in with the accession of George III. In the first place the young King was an Englishman born and bred. He himself laid great stress upon this, inserting with his own hand in the speech composed for him by Lord Chancellor Hardwicke at the opening of his first Parliament the sentence, 'Born and educated in this country, I glory in the name of Briton.' The phrase probably meant more than it actually expressed: it was an appeal to his fellow-countrymen to hanker no more after the discarded Stuarts, who had by this time become half-foreigners, and to be content with a true-born Englishman for their King.[1] The Church, at any rate, responded to the appeal, and we hear little more, except as a mere theory or sentiment, of that latent Jacobitism which had prevented so many of the clergy from giving more than a half-hearted allegiance to the Hanoverian dynasty. This fact in itself distinguishes the Church of the later from that of the earlier Georgian era. Another and more honourable distinction arose from the far better example of decency and respect for religion which was set by the Court. From the very commencement of his reign, George III. sternly set his face against irreligion and vice. One of his first acts was to issue a proclamation against immorality, which was generally approved. His marriage with Charlotte of Meck-

[1] I think he refers to this rather than to the fact that George I. and George II. had both been but half-Englishmen, though, of course, it is possible that this may be the reference.

lenberg Strelitz, in 1761, was the beginning of a life of domestic purity, which was not without its influence upon society. At the coronation of the young King and Queen, it was observed that the King took his crown off when he received the Holy Communion, a significant intimation that he meant to pay the deepest reverence to the mysteries of our Holy Religion, which he thoroughly carried out all through his after-life. Once more, with the accession of George, ended the baleful influence which Walpole had exercised over Church affairs, and which he left as a *damnosa hæreditas* to his successors, who for some years after his fall pursued a similar policy.

The strength and the weakness of the Church during the reign of George III. may be illustrated by a sketch of two or three typical prelates of the period. The young King found at his accession an occupant of Augustine's chair who was a very fair representative of the eighteenth-century prelate of a good type. *Thomas Secker* (1693-1768) had been on the Bench for twenty-six years, having been appointed Bishop of Bristol in 1734, of Oxford in 1737, and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1758. He had been brought up as a Dissenter, and had been schoolfellow at a Dissenting academy with the great Bishop Butler, with whom he maintained a lifelong friendship; but when he became a Churchman, he did so thoroughly, and is never weary in his sermons and charges of pointing out the beauty of the Church's services. Both sermons and charges give one the impression of his being a pious and sensible man. There is a robustness and manliness of tone about them which might well be copied by some of

the present generation, and his attainments were much above the average. He was so good a Hebraist that he was, we are told, always consulted by those who wrote anything on the subject of that language; his own compositions, still extant, show that he could write excellent Latin,[1] and his judgment on literary matters was so highly thought of that he was constantly asked to revise and correct the works of others.[2] But his mind was almost amusingly of the eighteenth-century type. It was the age of reason, and reasonableness is one of the keynotes of his teaching; it was the age of moderation, and moderation is one of his cardinal virtues; it had a horror of what it called enthusiasm, and so had Secker. Anything approaching 'Popery' on the one hand, or 'Puritanism' on the other, was his abhorrence; the Church of England was just in the right middle path between them. He was a pessimist as regards the age, an optimist as regards the Church. He vividly realized the irreligion and immorality of the age, but appears to have thought that the Church could do little more than she was doing to stem the torrent. The mere titles of some of his sermons will show us the mind of the man. 'Reliance on the Spirit of God, united with a *Proper Respect to our Understanding*,[3] in our Addresses to Almighty God,' is the title of three, and virtually of

[1] See Secker's Works, 4 vols., *passim*, and Life, by Bishop Beilby Porteus prefixed.

[2] Among other works which were thus submitted to him were those of the great Bishop Butler himself. Thomas Secker, Joseph Butler, and Martin Benson were so very closely connected together that we might almost call them 'Tres juncti in uno.'

[3] The italics in all cases are mine.

six, of his sermons on the Liturgy. 'The *Rational* Idea of a Christian Fast'; 'Of the Great, but Little Understood, Duty of *Moderation* in Sentiment and Manners,' are others. 'Beware,' he says in his sermon to the religious societies, which were still lingering on in 1754, 'of running into controversies and disputes. You have wisely guarded against these by admitting such persons only as are *well affected to our happy establishment in Church and State.*' One would have thought that Secker would have been a man after George III.'s own heart, but it was not so; he was never a favourite either with the new King or his predecessor, and yet no subject could be brought more into contact with his sovereign than Secker had been brought with George III. He baptized him in 1738, crowned him in 1760, married him in 1761, and subsequently baptized most of his children. Secker had been out of favour with George II., because that King thought that he might have done more to bring about a reconciliation between himself and his eldest son Frederic, Prince of Wales, who was for some time a parishioner of Secker's at St. James's, Westminster (Piccadilly), and attended that church with all his family. Possibly George III. may have had painful recollections of long and rather dreary sermons heard in his boyhood; at any rate, for whatever cause, Secker was never his favourite prelate.

Secker's sentiments were echoed, but in a very exaggerated form, by the first Bishop appointed in the new reign. *William Warburton* (1691-1769) was at last, at the ripe age of sixty-nine, exalted to the Bench as Bishop of Gloucester. Long before his exaltation he had reached the foremost rank of

theological writers, and if Queen Caroline had lived he would, no doubt, have been promoted long before. Such a mind as that of Warburton could hardly have been formed in any other period than the eighteenth century. It is true that in one sense 'moderation' was the very last quality that could be predicated of him, for his language was often outrageously extravagant; but in the eighteenth-century sense he was essentially 'moderate,' that is to say, his idea of the Church was that of a vessel sailing warily between Scylla and Charybdis, or, rather, a great number of Scyllas and Charybdises; and his mission in life was to annihilate all these obstacles to the Church's progress. In his 'Alliance between Church and State' he crushed all enemies of 'the Establishment'; in his 'Divine Legation of Moses' all Deists and Freethinkers generally; in his 'Doctrine of Grace' all Methodists, Mystics, and such like; in his 'View of Bolingbroke's Philosophy' he assailed one who was doubly obnoxious to him, both as an unbeliever and as a rival in the affections of Pope; and in his 'Remarks on Hume's "Natural History of Religion"' he, to use his own language, 'trimmed the rogue's jacket for him' most effectually. It is amusing to observe his perfect self-complacency in his achievements. In his 'Alliance' his adjustment of the relations between Church and State was so nice that the slightest alteration in any way would be dangerous. The Church surrendered to the State her independence and authority, while she was protected and supported by the legislature. The State selected for alliance, from motives of policy, the strongest religion, and should change if that religion did not maintain its authority. Toleration might be

allowed, but the Test Act was absolutely necessary, though the yearly Act of Indemnity might render its provisions innocuous. 'Thus,' he exclaims triumphantly, 'I have defended the justice and equity of our happy establishment at a time when the enemies of all Church establishments were commonly supposed to have demonstrated it to be indefensible.' His apparently paradoxical theory that the Divine Legation of Moses was shown by the absence of any mention of a future state in the Mosaic Dispensation, he considered that he had 'proved as demonstrably as a mathematical problem.' Methodists and mystics were not men to be argued with, for they were impervious to argument; so he abused them instead of confuting them.

Warburton had a faithful henchman, who in time became another typical Bishop of the period. *Richard Hurd* (1720-1808) was introduced to Warburton by a compliment he paid to his future patron in a preface to his edition of, and commentary on, Horace's 'Ars Poetica'; and though there was an interval of nearly thirty years between their ages, the two became fast friends. They were singularly different types of men, but there was no difference in their Church views; and by conviction, no less than personal feeling, Hurd was always ready to play the part of Polonius to Warburton's Hamlet. The correspondence between them, published in 1809, the year after Hurd's death, under the title of 'Letters from a late eminent Prelate to one of his Friends,' gives us a curious insight into the attitude taken by two representative bishops of the time of George III. towards Church matters. It was stiff and unbending in the highest degree. There was

one rut to walk in, and if anyone diverged from it one hair's breadth, he was condemned without benefit of clergy. Hurd was appointed, through the influence of Lord Mansfield, to the bishopric of Lichfield and Coventry at the close of 1774, and soon became the King's favourite Bishop. He was translated to Worcester in 1781, where the King paid him a memorable visit. He was a scholarly man, a good critic, and as determined an opponent of all religious enthusiasm as Warburton or Secker.

These three prelates have been selected as representing, in very different ways, the predominant sentiments of the time, not as being the most distinguished men on the Bench. William Lowth, Bishop of London, one of Warburton's many antagonists, might claim to be at least as distinguished as any of them; but he did not differ from them in grain, and he is not so strongly marked a specimen of the genus.

It was the rise of the Evangelical School which produced a less stereotyped, less optimistic, less wooden (if the expression may be allowed) style of Churchmanship; and that, not only among those who sympathized with the new school, but also among High Churchmen. This may sound strange, but is easily accounted for. It was impossible to meet the Methodists or Evangelicals (the terms were used indiscriminately) by simply throwing 'our happy establishment in Church and State' at their heads. So religious men were cast back upon a higher, a broader, a more spiritual view of Churchmanship. Let anyone compare the writings of such men as Horne, Horsley and Jones of Nayland with those of Secker, Warburton and Hurd, and he will see the

difference at once. Thus, by the hostility as well as by the sympathy which it evoked, Evangelicalism is really the most important feature in the Church history of the sixty years now before us.

At the time of King George's accession, Methodism, in the proper sense of the word, was, much against the wishes of its founder, fast drifting away from the Church. It is true that ordained clergymen were still the backbone of the movement, which, if they had withdrawn, would have collapsed at once; but, after a long study of it, I must reluctantly express my conviction that it was not a Church movement. What it might have been, if there had been a little more elasticity in the Church rulers, types of whom have just been noticed, is another question; as a matter of fact, it seems to me not to belong to the province of this work. It was only kept in a kind of nominal allegiance to the National Church by the commanding character of its founder, and by the unbounded influence he had over his followers; but when he died the separation was only a matter of time.

But side by side with Methodism proper, there was growing up Evangelicalism proper; the two worked together to a certain extent, and they so crossed and interlaced each other that it is quite impossible to disentangle them in the earlier days of each. But they were different movements, though the leaders themselves did not know it.

It complicated rather than simplified matters that the Methodists themselves became divided into two parties—the Arminian and the Calvinistic Methodists. The latter had two points of contact with the Evangelicals which the former had not; viz., their

Calvinism and their influence, in their early days, over the higher classes. Lady Huntingdon's drawing-room at Chelsea, her chapel at Bath, and sometimes even Whitefield's tabernacle itself, were frequented by what Whitefield calls 'tip-top gentility.' But, on the other hand, neither Whitefield nor Lady Huntingdon had anything like the firm attachment to the Church which John Wesley, in spite of all his irregularities, and Charles Wesley persistently maintained. Whitefield, at least in his early days, thought 'he had never well closed a sermon without a lash at the fat, downy doctors of the Establishment.' The Wesleys would never have dreamed of applying such a lash.

As a matter of fact, Lady Huntingdon's Connexion separated from the Church long before Wesley's societies did so. In 1781 a decision of the Consistorial Court of London about the Spa Fields chapel forced the Countess, much against her will, to seek shelter under the Toleration Act, and her chapels were registered as Dissenting places of worship. Whitefield had gone to his rest eleven years before, but Henry Venn, William Romaine, and other clergymen who had regularly or occasionally 'supplied' the chapels, had now to withdraw. But the seeds of separation had been sown before. The rules of the college which the Countess established at Trevecca, in North Wales, specified that the students, after three years' residence, might, if they desired, enter the ministry either of the Church or any other Protestant denomination. Berridge of Everton saw at once that Trevecca would thus become to all intents and purposes a Dissenting academy, and wrote to the Countess in his own

eccentric language: 'However rusty or rickety the Dissenters may appear to you, God hath His remnant among them; therefore lift not up your hand against them for the Lord's sake, nor yet for consistency's sake, because your students are as real Dissenting preachers as any in the land, unless a gown and band can make a clergyman.'[1] And again, in 1777: 'What will become of your students at your decease? They are virtual Dissenters now, and will be settled Dissenters then. And the same will happen to many, perhaps most, of Mr. Wesley's preachers at his death. He rules like a real Alexander, and is now stepping forth with a flaming torch; but we do not read in history of two Alexanders succeeding each other.'[2]

Curiously enough, in this very same year, 1777, John Wesley declared in his sermon, on laying the foundation of the City Road Chapel, that it was 'the fixed purpose' of his followers, 'let the clergy or laity use them well or ill, by the grace of God, to endure all things, to hold on their even course, and to continue in the Church, maugre men or devils, unless God permits them to be thrust out.' He contrasts them with the followers of Mr. Whitefield, 'who conversed much with Dissenters and contracted strong prejudices against the Church,' and with 'a school set up near Trevecca, where all who were educated (except those that were ordained, and some of them, too), as they disclaimed all connection with the Methodists, so they disclaimed the Church also; nay, they spoke of it upon all occasions with

[1] J. P. Gledstone's 'Life and Travels of G. Whitefield,' p. 465.

[2] 'Life and Times of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon,' ii. 423.

exquisite bitterness and contempt.' But 'we,' he concludes, 'do not, will not, form any separate sect, but from principle remain, what we have always been, true members of the Church of England.'

The Vicar of Everton proved a truer prophet than the 'late Fellow of Lincoln College'; but surely John Wesley was quite justified in contrasting Lady Huntingdon's system, as it *then* was, with his own. 'Her ladyship,' writes her biographer, 'erected or possessed herself of chapels in various parts of the kingdom, in which she appointed such persons to officiate as ministers as she thought fit, revoking such appointments at her pleasure. Congregations who worshipped here were called "Lady Huntingdon's Connexion," and the ministers who officiated "ministers in Lady Huntingdon's Connexion." Over the affairs of this Connexion Lady Huntingdon exercised a *moral* power to the time of her death; not only appointing and removing the ministers who officiated, but appointing laymen in each congregation to superintend its secular concerns, called "the Committee of Management."'[1] Could such a system be called, in the widest sense of the term, a part of the system of the Church of England?

At the same time, it is admitted that the Wesleys and Whitefield and Lady Huntingdon were in full agreement with the Evangelical Churchmen in all the cardinal doctrines which were insisted on in the Evangelical Revival; nay, that they were the first who roused up in the country a more spiritual religion than 'the age of reason' presented. It has been shown, indeed, in a series of 'Biographical Sketches'

[1] 'Life of Lady Huntingdon,' ii. 490.

in the *Christian Observer* for 1877 that there were many true Evangelicals in the country who did not owe their religion either to the Wesley or the Whitefield movement. Very graphic accounts of these good men are given, and the points of divergence between the Methodists and Evangelicals forcibly and fairly brought out. But these are isolated cases, exceptions which prove the rule that the Wesleys and Whitefield were the first who began the movement which became a real power throughout the kingdom. All that is contended for is, that neither the Calvinistic nor the Arminian form of Methodism was a system which did, or perhaps even could, retain its place within the pale of the Church of England, and that therefore it hardly comes within the scope of the present work. But Evangelicalism, as distinguished from Methodism, is one of the most important subjects with which the Church historian of the eighteenth century has to deal, and to this we must now turn.

The Methodist and Evangelical movements being closely connected, we find, as we might expect, several good men who were a sort of connecting-link between the two. Among these was *James Hervey* (1714-1758), who had been John Wesley's pupil, and we may add disciple, at Lincoln College. He never took any part in the itinerant work, but was content to live a quiet, blameless, useful life, holding two very small country livings, Weston Favell and Collington, in Northamptonshire. His services to the cause were rendered by his pen. Hervey's 'Meditations' is still a popular devotional book among some old-fashioned people; but when it was first published, it was so popular that it to

a great extent superseded Law's 'Serious Call,' and it reached a twenty-fifth edition in 1791. Its full title is, 'Meditations and Contemplations.' The first volume appeared in February, 1745-6; the second in 1747. Its growing popularity is an indication of the growing advance of the Evangelical school, for its merits as a composition are not of a high order. It is full of truisms, expressed in the most florid language, and naturally did not find much favour with the writer's old tutor, John Wesley, who disliked its inflated style as much as its Calvinistic sentiments. It was followed in 1755 by 'Dialogues between Theron and Aspasio,' in three volumes, in which Aspasio endeavours to convince Theron of the doctrine of imputed righteousness. This was not quite so popular as its predecessor, but was still very widely read.

*William Grimshaw of Haworth* (1708-1763) and *John Berridge of Everton* (1716-1793) were also links between the Evangelicals and the Methodists. The former was a warm friend of the Wesleys, whom he used to welcome at Haworth, where he built a Methodist chapel. He not only exercised the strictest discipline in his own wild moorland parish, but itinerated most energetically and successfully throughout the neighbourhood. His eccentricities were only equalled by his intense earnestness, but they were not so great as those of Berridge, who also did a vast amount of itinerant work in the Midland counties, besides revolutionizing his own parish of Everton. Everton Church was the scene of many of those violent physical symptoms which were the results of the preaching of Wesley, who describes them most vividly in his journal. Both Grimshaw and Berridge

were Calvinists, and Berridge uttered, and, worse still, printed, some most virulent abuse of Wesley on account of his Arminianism; but he was a most indefatigable and successful evangelist. He was a firm friend of Lady Huntingdon, and thus connects the Evangelicals with the Calvinistic as well as with the Arminian section of the Methodists.

Another name which was still more closely connected with the Calvinistic Methodists was that of *William Romaine* (1714-1795). He was Lady Huntingdon's confidential adviser until the separation of 1781. A more complete contrast than that which William Romaine presents to the two worthies last noticed can scarcely be conceived. He was grave, severe, self-restrained, and, except to those who knew him intimately, somewhat repellent in manners; but he was well suited for his sphere of work in London, where he ministered, first at S. George's, Hanover Square, and then at S. Anne's, Blackfriars, his only preferment. He suffered annoyance, which amounted to persecution, but he lived it down. In his way he had, perhaps, the greatest power of all the early Evangelicals. A man of high University standing, who more than justified in after-life his reputation at Oxford, he could not be despised as an ignoramus. His Calvinism was of a more extreme type than that of any of the band, and theoretically verged on Antinomianism.[1] His 'Life, Walk, and Triumph of Faith' is a remarkable work, which reminds one more of the earlier Puritanism than of the later Evangelicalism.

[1] William Wilberforce says that John Newton 'owned' to him that Romaine had made many Antinomians (Journal for 1795). See 'Life of W. Wilberforce by his Sons,' ii. 137.

Another clergyman who also belonged to Lady Huntingdon's Connexion was *Henry Venn* (1724-1797), who did in a large manufacturing town what Romaine did in London, and Grimshaw and Berridge in the country. The twelve years which he spent as Vicar of Huddersfield were the most memorable years of his active life; but the twenty-six years in which he lived in the country village of Yelling, where he was incumbent, and where he died, were not years of inactivity. He was one of the brightest stars in the early Evangelical firmament, and his 'Complete Duty of Man,' written as a sort of counter-blast against the defective theology (according to the Evangelical view) of 'The Whole Duty of Man,' was a most valuable and deservedly popular practical treatise.

We now pass on to those who were Evangelicals pure and simple; and the first name that occurs is that of *John Newton* (1725-1807), who had no connection with the active work of either of the sections of Methodists. Yet Newton himself owed much to George Whitefield, of whom he became so enthusiastic a disciple that he was called 'a young Whitefield.' Newton could do what few of the other Evangelicals could: he could sympathize, in the literal sense of the word, with the grossest profligates who were bowed down with a sense of shame and yearned after a higher and better life, for he had passed through such an experience himself. An infidel, a blasphemer, a sensualist, a corrupter of others, despised by the very negroes among whom his lot as a slave-trader was cast—such was Newton in his earlier years. The story of the blessed change cannot here be told. He became a most earnest

Christian worker, first at the little town of Olney, and then in London at S. Mary Woolnoth. Under a rough exterior he concealed the tenderest of hearts, and was sought for as a spiritual director by men of all classes. Considering his imperfect education, it is wonderful how much he learnt, and how well he could write. His published sermons are well worth reading even now, and his published letters, rightly named 'Cardiphonia,' for they evidently are 'the voice of his heart,' might well become popular. Newton was not the less effective because a vein of humour, of a far higher and more refined cast than that of Berridge or Grimshaw, runs through all his writings, and also his conversation, as we gather from the specimens of it preserved by his friend Cecil.

The name of Newton suggests that of *Thomas Scott* (1746-1821), his spiritual son, and successor at Olney. If anyone doubts Newton's tenderness and forbearance, let him study the relations between the two. Scott worked his way slowly and laboriously from a sort of Socinianism to the Evangelical faith with no *human* help but that of Newton, and lived on to become a connecting-link between the first and the second generation of Evangelicals. His 'Force of Truth,' in which he lays bare the whole history of his spiritual experience, is one of the most striking treatises ever published by the Evangelical School; and his 'Commentary on the Bible,' though, of course, superseded by later and more learned works, held an important place of its own in the Evangelical literature of its class, while its usefulness extended beyond the limits of the Evangelical party. Scott met with no adequate reward on earth—he expected

none—for his varied labours. At Olney and at the Lock Hospital in London he had hard and ungrateful work with a poor pittance of pay; but his old age was passed in comparative peace. His change from London to the country living of Aston Sandford was a refreshing if not a remunerative one.

We next come to the most refined and cultured of all the early Evangelicals, *Richard Cecil* (1748-1810). His delicate health prevented him from taking a very active part in the Evangelical movement, but in his own way he contributed in no slight degree to its success. There was a stately dignity both in his character and in his style of writing, which was very impressive. His 'Remains' show traces of a scholarly habit of mind, a sense of humour, a grasp of leading principles, a liberality of thought, and a capacity of appreciating good, which render them, short though they are, a singularly valuable contribution to Evangelical literature.[1] His position at S. John's, Bedford Row, was unique; it became in his time a centre of Evangelical organization, and continued to be so long after his death.

Two other clergymen who were leaders of the Evangelical movement claim a separate notice—the brothers Milner. *Joseph Milner* (1744-1797), the elder brother, lived an uneventful life. Having taken a good degree at Cambridge, he was appointed at an early age Headmaster of the Grammar School, Hull, and in that town he spent the rest of his life. In course of time he became also Vicar of North Ferriby, and only a few weeks before his death

[1] See 'The Remains of the Rev. R. Cecil,' arranged by Josiah Pratt, *passim*.

Vicar of Holy Trinity, the largest church in Hull. His 'History of the Church of Christ' is more valuable, perhaps, from its plan—which was suggested by a fragment written by Newton at Olney—than from its execution. That plan was 'to trace the goodness of God in every age'—to write, in fact, a history of real, not nominal, Christians. It is easy, no doubt, to pick out faults arising from imperfect knowledge and from the prejudices of partisanship,[1] but we may well bear with the shortcomings of a Church History which, instead of perplexing the mind with the interminable disputes of professing Christians, makes it its main business to detect the spirit of Christ wherever it can be found. Joseph Milner died when the History had reached the middle of the thirteenth century—that is, at the end of the third volume; the fourth, which carries the work down to the middle of the sixteenth century, was the work of his younger brother, Isaac.

*Isaac Milner* (1751-1820) is another link between the first and the second generation of Evangelicals. He is the first instance of an Evangelical attaining any high preferment in the Church. Having been Senior Wrangler, with the epithet *incomparabilis* attached to his name, and First Smith's Prizeman, he continued to reside at Cambridge, and was appointed Professor of Mathematics, President of his college (Queens'), and finally Dean of Carlisle. Of course, under Milner, Queens' became a School of the

[1] Dr. S. Maitland published a volume of remorseless 'Strictures on Milner's Church History,' which the Rev. J. King gallantly essayed to answer. But Dr. Maitland was a far more learned man, and a far better writer, than either Mr. King or Mr. Milner.

Prophets, where Evangelical clergymen in embryo were trained. He was also a sort of general adviser and referee in cases of difficulty, and for many years the burly figure of the Dean, which towered and bulked conspicuously among lesser men, was an apt emblem of the position he held among the Evangelicals.

It is hard to know where to draw the line in noticing the first clerical leaders of the Evangelical party. In any extended history of the movement, such names as those of Robinson of Leicester, Richardson of York, Haweis of Aldwinkle, Jowett of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, Walker of Truro, Adam of Winteringham, ought certainly to find a place; but in a short sketch like this it is now high time to remember that the laity claim notice; for it is one of the distinctive excellences of Evangelicism that it revived the interest of the laity (which, as we have seen, had been lamentably drooping in the early Georgian era) in Church work. Before noticing those who worked more or less in combination, we must mention one who was in a way *sui generis*, but who in his line was the most distinguished and influential of all Evangelicals.

*William Cowper* (1731-1800) contributed towards the spread of Evangelicism in a way in which none of his contemporaries could follow him. Men who would never have listened to the preaching or read the works of the Evangelical clergy would lend an ear to the Evangelical poet; and though he does not write sermons in verse, yet not only does a vein of piety run through all his poems, but it seems to me that his chief object in writing was to recommend practical, experimental religion of the Evangelical

type. He often does this indirectly rather than directly, but not the less effectively on that account. By his means Evangelical theology, in its most attractive form, gained access into quarters into which no Evangelical preachers could ever have penetrated. He was known as an Evangelical, the friend of Newton, the indignant defender of Whitefield; and thus, if he had done no other service to the Evangelical cause, this alone would have been an inestimable one—that he showed to the world that the Evangelical system was not incompatible with true genius, ripe scholarship, sparkling wit, and a refined and cultivated taste.

But we must turn to those laymen who worked avowedly and in concert on Evangelical lines; and the first group that claims our attention is, of course, the 'Clapham Sect,' so called because Clapham was the centre of their work, some of them living there, and most of them worshipping in Clapham Parish Church. 'On Sunday,' writes Mr. J. C. Colquhoun, 'they [the Thorntons] sit in the old church with the Wilberforces' and Macaulays' and Stephens' pews close to their own, and in the front gallery the Teignmouths', and listen to the wise discourses of Venn, or sit enchanted under the preaching of Gisborne.'[1]

The central figure of the group was *William Wilberforce* (1759-1833). He was a link between

[1] 'William Wilberforce, his Friends and his Times,' p. 309. For a later view of the Clapham Sect, see Canon Pennington's interesting chapter, 'Recollections of Clapham Common and its Former Inhabitants,' in his 'Recollections of Persons and Events.' Canon Pennington writes from personal knowledge, and from the information given him by his own father and mother, who lived at Clapham all through the time when the 'sect' was flourishing.

the first and the second generation of Evangelicals, and also between the Evangelicals and the outer world. He aided the cause with his purse, with his eloquence in Parliament, and with his pen. No one could quite take the position that he did; few were endowed with such extraordinary powers of fascination, and none could gain the ear of so many powerful friends. With a boundless liberality, to which great wealth enabled him to give full scope, a devoted attachment to what he believed to be the truth, a dogged perseverance in carrying out his purposes, which no difficulties could daunt, and an absolute disregard for all personal advancement, he was a mighty engine for the spread of Evangelicism. He has been called 'the head—indeed, the founder—of a powerful religious sect.'[1] He was not the founder. Evangelicalism (the 'sect' referred to) was a power before Wilberforce gave in his adherence to it. He was the product, rather than the originator, of the movement, owing his conversion, humanly speaking, to Isaac Milner, John Newton, and Thomas Scott, and established in it by John Venn; but he is rightly termed, in one sense, the 'head': for though in some important points he did not agree with his Evangelical friends, he threw in his lot with them in the main, and was looked up to by them as their great supporter, as he well deserved to be. And not the least of the services which he rendered to the cause was his little work, entitled in full, 'A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians in the Higher and Middle Classes in this Country, contrasted with Real

[1] 'Statesmen of the Time of George III.,' by Lord Brougham. First series, vol. ii.: 'Mr. Wilberforce.'

Christianity,' first published in 1797. 'Mr. Wilberforce's "Practical View,"' writes Thomas Scott, 'is a most noble and manly stand for the Gospel; full of good sense and most useful observations on subjects quite out of our line, and in all respects fitted for usefulness; and coming from such a man, it will probably be read by many thousands who can by no means be brought to attend either to our preaching or writings, especially the rich.'[1] Scott proved a true prophet. No book since the publication of the 'Serious Call' exercised a wider and deeper influence than the 'Practical View.' The fact that it was written by a layman—and such a layman!—added immensely to its influence. Of Wilberforce's great work in connection with the slave trade and slavery more will be said presently.

Next to Wilberforce come the Thorntons, his relatives. *John Thornton*, the father, was a wealthy banker, who literally regarded his wealth as a talent entrusted to him for his Master's use. His princely liberality rivalled that of Wilberforce himself; and it flowed largely into a channel where it was sorely needed. The early Evangelical clergy were quite cut off from preferment in the Church, and were generally in poor circumstances. John Thornton relieved them with unbounded munificence. To take one instance out of many, Newton told Cecil that he thought he had received from Mr. Thornton upwards of £3,000 during the time he resided at Olney. This was, of course, for works of charity, as well as his own needs. 'He was,' writes Mr. Cecil, 'a philanthropist on the largest scale, the

[1] 'Life of Thomas Scott,' by his son, John Scott, p. 341.

friend of man under all his wants. Instances might be mentioned of it, were it proper to particularize, which would surprise those who did not know Mr. Thornton. They were so much out of ordinary course and expectation that I know some who felt it their duty to inquire of him whether the sum they had received was sent by his intention or by mistake' —and much more to the same effect.[1]

His mantle fell upon a worthy son, who had opportunities of doing good which were not open to the father. *Henry Thornton* is said to have divided his income (which was very large) into two parts, retaining only one-seventh for his own use, and devoting six-sevenths to charity. After he became the head of a family, he gave two-thirds away, retaining one-third for himself and his family. But he could help the Evangelical cause in other ways. As M.P. for the great county of Surrey, he was a power in Parliament. Lord Brougham, who was in Parliament with him, describes him as 'the most eminent in every respect' of the Wilberforce coterie. Unlike Wilberforce, he was no orator, but he was a man of weight in other respects. He was Wilberforce's chief lieutenant in the crusade against the slave trade, one of the chief founders and first treasurer of the Church Missionary Society, the life and soul of the project of founding a colony at Sierra Leone, one of the first promoters of, and a most voluminous and valued contributor to, the *Christian Observer*, and the first treasurer of the British and Foreign Bible Society. In short, in all the schemes of the Evangelicals he took a leading part.

[1] See 'Life of John Newton,' pp. 56-59.

*Zachary Macaulay* was another Claphamite, who was editor of the *Christian Observer*, after the first few numbers, for fifteen years. He also took a leading part in all the schemes mentioned above, and was an important member of what has been termed Wilberforce's 'interior cabinet.' So, too, was *James Stephen*, a lawyer, whose legal acumen was of great service to the cause which he had espoused, especially in its relation to the abolition of the slave trade. As an intimate friend of a Prime Minister (Mr. Perceval), he had great influence. *John, Lord Teignmouth*, first President of the Bible Society, is the only other lay member of the group that need be specially noticed; but we must not forget the clergyman who bound them all together. *John Venn* (1759-1813) was the very man to lead such a congregation as that which met at Clapham, and was thoroughly appreciated by them all. His very name would tell in his favour, for he was the son of that Henry Venn who stood in the first rank of the first Evangelicals. But he was a calmer man than his father, and we can well believe how invaluable his well-balanced mind would be, not only for informing, but also for checking any excesses into which earnest laymen, who have not made any special study of theology, are apt to fall. 'In purely ecclesiastical matters,' we are told, 'Wilberforce always consulted John Venn or Simeon.' John Venn was Rector of Clapham for twenty-one years, having succeeded another noted Evangelical, Dr. Stonehouse, and being succeeded by another, Dr. Dealtry. 'Clapham,' writes Mr. Colquhoun, 'was highly favoured, as both in John Venn and his successor, Dr. Dealtry, they possessed clergy of zeal and wisdom, with the special charac-

teristics of their Church—learning, earnestness, and wise moderation.'[1]

But there was another clergyman whose appearance in the Clapham pulpit was always looked forward to as a rich intellectual treat. This was *Thomas Gisborne* (1758-1846), who lived at Yoxall Lodge, in Needwood Forest, undertaking the charge of the populous village of Barton. He was, of course, only an occasional visitor at Clapham, but it is astonishing how highly his preaching was appreciated. 'He approached,' writes Sir James Stephen, who had no doubt often heard him in his boyhood, 'more nearly than any Anglican clergyman of his time towards the ideal of that much-neglected art.'[2] It must be confessed that the printed sermons of Gisborne hardly bear out this encomium; but they would probably sound better when heard than they appear when read. The good men of Clapham will reappear when the general work of the revival is summed up. But besides this general work, 'schools, prison-discipline, savings-banks, tracts, village libraries, district visitings, and church-building each for a time rivalled their cosmopolitan projects. In short, they, if any men could, might bear the test, "By their fruits ye shall know them."'[3]

In one sense, Cambridge was an even more important centre of Evangelicalism than Clapham itself; for it was the chief training-ground of the future clergy who were, after all, the backbone of the movement. This introduces us to the honoured name of *Charles Simeon* (1759-1836). How Simeon,

[1] 'William Wilberforce, his Friends and his Times,' p. 323.
[2] 'Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography': 'The Clapham Sect.'
[3] Sir James Stephen, *ut supra.*

as Fellow of King's College, undertook the charge of Trinity Church, a college living, at a merely nominal stipend; how he was opposed by churchwardens, parishioners, and afternoon lecturers; in what a Christian spirit he bore it all, keeping constantly before him the text, 'The servant of the Lord must not strive'; how, after twelve weary years, he lived down all opposition; how he attracted gownsmen as well as townsmen to his church, and exerted a religious influence over the former such as had never been exercised by any clergyman for many a long year; how he found for his protégés curacies with kindred spirits, or Indian chaplaincies, and corresponded with them frequently, kindling their zeal, but checking their indiscretions in the kindliest and quaintest fashion; how he instituted private societies, held conversation-parties, supported by the weight of his influence (which became greater and greater) every Evangelical organization in the great University town, and helped on the cause there and everywhere in a thousand other ways, cannot here be told at length. Suffice it to say, that no figure stands out so conspicuously—no, not even that of the great Dean himself—as that of Charles Simeon.[1]

Dean Milner, however, was also a great power at Cambridge. In a place where intellectual preeminence would naturally have very great—perhaps disproportionate—weight, it was no slight advantage to have a champion who was in this respect *incomparabilis*. 'Under the shelter of his name,' writes Sir James Stephen, 'his college flourished

[1] See Canon Carus' 'Life of Simeon,' and Mr. Moule's interesting little monograph, 'Charles Simeon,' in the 'English Leaders of Religion' series.

as the best cultured and most fruitful nursery of Evangelicals.'

But this description would apply at least as well to Magdalene College, which is described by a staunch Evangelical as being in 1786 'the general resort of young men seriously impressed with a sense of religion.'[1] The great attraction at Magdalene was *William Farish* (1759-1837), who was the college tutor, and Jacksonian Professor of Chemistry. Like Milner, he had been Senior Wrangler, and continued his mathematical and other intellectual pursuits all through his life; like Simeon, he took charge of a parish in Cambridge —St. Giles'—and there worked on the same lines as Simeon, and with almost equal success.

Among other pillars of the Evangelical cause at Cambridge were Thomas Thomason, Simeon's curate, who will meet us again in connection with India; James Scholefield, Fellow of Trinity, Regius Professor of Greek, and Incumbent of S. Michael's, where he presented to the gownsmen who frequented his church the intellectual side of Christianity more than either Simeon or Farish did; the two Jowetts, Joseph, the uncle (1752-1813), the intimate friend of Dean Milner, who was Fellow and Tutor of Trinity Hall, and Regius Professor of Civil Law, and William, the nephew (1787-1855), Fellow of S. John's, and a noted writer in his day; and William Dealtry, who was resident Fellow of Trinity until he succeeded John Venn at Clapham in 1813.

Cambridge was fed with Evangelical pupils by various clerical education societies, founded for the purpose of helping young men of straitened means

[1] The Rev. John King, of Hull, in his 'Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Dykes,' a Magdalene man, p. 6.

to pay the expenses of a University education, with a view to their becoming Evangelical clergymen. The first and most famous of these was the Elland Society in Yorkshire; another was founded at Little Dunham, in Norfolk, by John Venn; another at Bristol; another at Creaton, in Northamptonshire.

Of course there were also students at Oxford who were helped by these societies; but Oxford was never a stronghold of Evangelicalism, the humble little Hall of S. Edmund being its only home in that University during the first two generations of Evangelicals.

In the early part of the nineteenth century London was becoming well stocked with Evangelical clergymen. S. John's proprietary chapel, Bedford Row, still had Richard Cecil, and on his death, in 1710, Daniel Wilson, an equally staunch Evangelical, succeeded him; it was for many years the Metropolitan centre of Evangelical work; S. Mary's Woolnoth retained John Newton until 1806, and then seems to have dropped out of prominence; the Lock Hospital had another Evangelical, Mr. Fry, as successor to Thomas Scott in 1802; Clerkenwell had Henry Foster, who had been an assistant to William Romaine; S. Anne's, Blackfriars, William Goode, who had been curate to Romaine, and succeeded him there as Rector in 1795; Basil Wood, a most estimable Evangelical of a markedly Church type, was at Bentinck Chapel for forty-six years; Josiah Pratt, of whom we shall see more anon, was at Wheler Chapel, Spital Square; and Welbeck Chapel, or, to give it its proper title, S. James', Welbeck Street, had Claudius Buchanan, and after him another famous man, Edward Bickersteth. In the

country were Legh Richmond, first in the Isle of Wight, and then at Turvey, in Bedfordshire; Mr. Pugh, at Rauceby, of whom we shall hear again; Thomas Dykes, John Scott, and William Knight at Hull; William Richardson and John Overton at York; Samuel Knight at Halifax. But it is impossible to give the list of Evangelical clergymen; their numbers had increased twenty-fold since the first generation had begun to die off. Bishops were beginning to sympathize with them: Bishop Beilby Porteus had at one time been the only prelate on whom they could at all count; but now the Bishop of Durham (Dr. Shute Barrington), and the Bishop of St. Davids, and afterwards of Salisbury (Dr. Burgess), certainly sympathized with them; and in 1815 Dr. Henry Ryder, Dean of Wells, whom the Evangelicals regarded as their own, was promoted to the bishopric of Gloucester. Royalty was also in their favour. Both King George and Queen Charlotte had, many years before, shown their sympathy with Lady Huntingdon, and the King had expressed his appreciation of the work of the Wesleys and Whitefield; his son, Edward, Duke of Kent, had almost identified himself with the Evangelical cause. 'Every religious and benevolent undertaking found a powerful friend and patron,' writes Mr. Grimshaw, the Evangelical biographer of Mr. Legh Richmond, who was the Duke's chaplain. It was also supported by many influential laymen, such as Mr. Spencer Perceval, the Prime Minister, whose tragical death in 1812 was a great blow to the cause; the Earl of Harrowby, elder brother of Bishop Ryder; Lord Dartmouth (who 'wears a coronet and prays,' and to whom John Newton's 'Letters to a Nobleman' are addressed);

Mr. Abel Smith, the patron of Edward Bickersteth; Sir T. D. Acland; Sir T. Fowell Buxton; and Mr. Carus Wilson, M.P. for Pontefract, and father of the Rev. Carus Wilson, a leading Evangelical of a little later date; but I doubt whether all this support, royal, episcopal, and Parliamentary, was more valuable than that of one simple lady, whose writings were once regarded as having reached almost the acme of English literature.

It is hardly necessary to say that this was Mrs. *Hannah More* (1745-1833), who, like Wilberforce, formed an important link, both between two generations of Evangelicals, and also between the Evangelicals generally and the outer world. Perhaps at the present day it may be thought that Hannah More's most valuable work was done among the Cheddar Hills, where, in conjunction with her sisters, and in the teeth of the most violent opposition, she established schools, visited the poor at their homes, and, aided by the money of Wilberforce and Thornton, and by the wise advice of Bishop Porteus and John Newton, turned a moral wilderness into a fruitful garden. But in her own day it was her pen that gave her her highest title to renown. The language which men, who were presumably competent judges, use about Hannah More's writings could hardly have been stronger if she had been a Shakespeare or a Milton; and their wide-spread popularity is shown by the enormous sale they met with. A writer with such a reputation was an acquisition to the 'calumniated school' (as Hannah More called the Evangelicals), the value of which it is difficult to overestimate.

The results of the Evangelical movement, so far

as the Church was concerned, were manifold. We must not dwell upon the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, because it only so far affected the Church as any movement for good might do. Of course there were others who took their share in the work. Granville Sharp, for instance, whose pen first drew the attention of the country to the horrors of the African slave trade, though he was in deep sympathy with the Evangelicals in very many points, can perhaps hardly be said to have belonged to the party. Neither can Thomas Clarkson, Lord Brougham, Earl Grey, Lord Grenville, Pitt or Fox. But while doing full justice to the efforts of these and others, it seems to me that it was the untiring energy of Wilberforce, fortified by Henry Thornton, *Z.* Macaulay, James Stephen, and in his own way by William Cowper, that really brought about the great result.

The Religious Tract Society, founded in 1799, the Naval and Military Bible Society in 1780, the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1804, and the London Missionary Society in 1795, though not exclusively the outcome of the Evangelical party in the Church of England, owed their establishment very largely to it. But the *Church Missionary Society*, founded in 1799, was exclusively its work. If one man had to be selected as its father, that man would be John Venn, to whom more than to anyone else the rules on which the society was worked are due. Among others who were closely connected with its foundation were Mr. Pugh, at whose rectory at Rauceby in Lincolnshire the idea was first started, Charles Simeon, Thomas Scott, William Wilberforce, and all the members of the Clapham Sect; and last, but certainly not least, Josiah Pratt, the first

secretary, whose clear head, business talents and conciliatory spirit made his services only second, if second, to those of John Venn.

But the effects of Evangelicalism upon the Church were far greater and more widely extended than a mere enumeration of the achievements actually accomplished by it can indicate. Mr. Lecky goes so far as to say that 'the Evangelicals gradually changed the whole spirit of the English Church. They infused into it a new fire and passion of devotion, raised the standard of clerical duty, and completely altered the whole tone and tendency of the preaching of its ministers.'[1] This is so far true that the Evangelical revival, including the Methodist movement proper, as well as that of the Evangelical party in the Church, certainly did draw attention to truths which had been too much put in the background. As early as 1758, when Methodism was in its full swing, but Evangelicalism, as it was later understood, was scarcely known, our old friend Archbishop Secker made some admirable remarks in his Charge to the diocese of Canterbury. Speaking of 'the new sect pretending to the strictest piety,' he urges his clergy 'to emulate what is good in them, avoiding what is bad; to edify their parishioners with awakening, but rational and Scriptural, discourses; to teach the principles, not only of virtue and natural religion, but of the Gospel, not as almost refined away by the modern refiner, but the truth as it is in Jesus, and as it is taught in the Church.' Many years later Bishop Horsley, in his first Charge to the diocese of St. David's (1790), having described

[1] 'History of England in the Eighteenth Century,' vol. ii., ch. ix.

in that clear, incisive style of which he was so consummate a master, 'a strain of preaching' which resembled 'the strict but impracticable and sullen morality of the Stoic,' and preachers who 'made no other use of the high commission they bore than to come abroad, one day in the seven, dressed in solemn looks and in the garb of holiness, to be the apes of Epictetus,' adds: 'I flatter myself we are in a state of recovery from the delusion. The compositions which are at this day delivered from our pulpits are, I think, in general, of a more Christian cast than were often heard thirty years since, when I entered the ministry.' He does not add that those thirty years were just the years during which the Evangelical revival was gradually making itself more and more felt.

It must not, however, be supposed that the practical work of the Church in the reign of George III. was confined to the efforts of the Evangelical party. There is, for instance, no reason for thinking, so far as I am aware, that the originators of the Sunday-school scheme, one of the most notable schemes of the period, were influenced by the Evangelical movement, though none took it up more heartily and successfully than the Evangelicals.

The date of the establishment of *Sunday-schools* is generally fixed at 1781, though there were certainly isolated instances of Sunday-schools before that time. Robert Raikes, the proprietor and editor of the *Gloucester Journal*, and Thomas Stock, curate, and afterwards Rector, of S. John the Baptist Church, Gloucester, were Churchmen, but not, so far as I can discover, Evangelicals. The work has become so essentially a part of the Church's system that it

is not beside the point to quote Mr. Stock's own simple and modest account of its origin: 'Mr. Raikes, meeting me one day by accident at my own door, and in the course of conversation lamenting the deplorable state of the lower classes of mankind, took particular notice of the situation of the poorer children. I had made, I replied, the same observation, and told him, if he would accompany me into my own parish, we would make some attempts to remedy the evil. We immediately proceeded to the business, and procuring the names of about ninety children, placed them under the care of four persons for a stated number of hours on the Sunday. As minister of the parish I took upon me the superintendence of the schools, and one-third of the expenses. The progress of this institution through the kingdom is justly to be attributed to the constant representations which Mr. Raikes made in his own paper, the *Gloucester Journal*, of the benefits which he perceived would possibly arise from it.'

Again, among the evidence writers of the later part of the eighteenth century, none was so effective as *William Paley* (1743-1805), who certainly cannot be called an Evangelical. It is rather too much the tendency of the present day to depreciate Paley; but, within his limits, he seems to me a writer second only to Butler. He was perfectly justified in writing, in the dedication of the 'Natural Theology,' his last and perhaps most valuable work, to Bishop Shute Barrington, his patron: 'The following discussion alone was wanted to make up my works into a system; in which works, such as they are, the public have now before them the evidences of Natural Religion, the evidences of Revealed Reli-

gion, and an account of the duties that result from both.' Bishop Watson, again, though his 'Anecdotes of his own Life,' rather prejudice us against him as a Bishop, and even as a man, was an able defender of Christianity about the same period, and he certainly cannot be labelled as an Evangelical.

But there were others whose Churchmanship was more distinct. Foremost among these stands the great and good *Dr. Johnson* (1709-1784). 'Dr. Johnson,' writes Earl Stanhope, 'stemmed the tide of infidelity.' And the greatest of modern satirists does not state the case too strongly when he says that 'Johnson had the ear of the nation. His immense authority reconciled it to loyalty, and shamed it out of irreligion. He was revered as a sort of oracle, and the oracle declared for Church and King. He was a fierce foe to all sin, but a gentle enemy to all sinners.'[1] But Dr. Johnson was more than a Church and King man. He was a very distinct High Churchman in the nobler sense of the term, and showed it in his practice as well as in his words. And the remarkable thing is that when he uttered sentiments which filled the Presbyterian Boswell with wonder and dismay, but which were perfectly in accord with those of Andrewes, Hammond, Ken, and his own spiritual father, William Law, he uttered them as if they would not be regarded as novelties, but as sentiments in which all true Churchmen (among whom he would not reckon Boswell) would agree. Another splendid specimen of the High Church layman of the period was *Edmund Burke* (1729-1797). 'Burke,' writes his biographer and namesake, 'had more in common

[1] W. M. Thackeray's 'English Humourists of the Eighteenth Century.'

with the High Church notions of previous times, and the Puseyite doctrines of subsequent, than with the sober Whig theology of his own day'[1]—that is, in other words, the system of the English Church had a powerful hold upon him, as his earlier utterances, no less than his later, when he became a Church and King man, plainly show.

Having given, as specimens, two of the most distinguished of the laity, let us now take two of the most distinguished of the clergy.

*Samuel Horsley* (1733-1806) had quite the highest reputation for learning and ability of any Bishop, or, indeed, divine, of his day. He is 'our ablest modern prelate';[2] 'the one red leaf, the last of its clan, with relation to the learned teachers of our Church';[3] 'the first episcopal authority (if learning, wisdom, and knowledge of the Scriptures be any foundation for authority)';[4] 'the light and glory of the Established Church.'[5] Unlike some others that have been mentioned, Horsley's printed works, though not voluminous, fully bear out his contemporary reputation. His utter annihilation of Dr. Priestley reminds one of the palmy days of the apologists, when Bentley crushed Collins, Waterland Clarke, and Butler the Deists, *en masse*. His sarcasm gains rather than loses pungency from the dignity, the composure, the absence of scurrility and

[1] 'Public and Domestic Life of the Right Hon. Edmund Burke,' by Peter Burke, p. 50.

[2] Bishop Jebb. See Forster's 'Life of Jebb,' p. 408.

[3] S. T. Coleridge, introduction to 'Essays on his own Times.'

[4] Dean Isaac Milner; see 'Life,' p. 212.

[5] Bishop John Milner, prefatory address to 'The End of Controversy.'

personality, in which he deals with his antagonist. What his Church principles were may be gathered from the following passage: 'To be a High Churchman in the only sense which the word can be allowed to bear as applicable to any in the present day—God forbid that this should ever cease to be my public pretension, my pride, my glory! In the language of our modern sectaries, everyone is a High Churchman who is not unwilling to recognise so much as the spiritual authority of the priesthood; everyone who, denying what we ourselves disclaim, anything of a Divine right to temporalities, acknowledges, however, in the sacred character, somewhat more Divine than may belong to the mere hired servants of the State or of the laity, and regards the services which we are thought to perform for our pay as something more than a part to be gravely played in the drama of human politics. My reverend brethren, we must be content to be High Churchmen according to this usage of the word, or we cannot be Churchmen at all; for he who thinks of God's ministers as the mere servants of the State is out of the Church, severed from it by a kind of self-excommunication.'[1]

*George Horne* (1730-1792), Bishop of Norwich, cannot compare for a moment with Bishop Horsley in grasp of intellect, but he was a more lovable, perhaps a more spiritually-minded, man. Like many earnest men of the day, he fell under the imputation of Methodism, but he seems to me to have treated the Methodists just as a spiritually-minded High Churchman *would* treat them. Personally he showed a sympathy with them. He strongly disapproved

[1] First Charge of the Bishop of S. David's, 1790.

of the expulsion of the six Methodist students from S. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, he being at the time a University authority, as President of Magdalen College. He would not have John Wesley, 'an ordained minister of the Church of England,' forbidden to preach in his diocese; but, with perfect consistency, he protested, in a sermon preached before the University of Oxford in 1761, against the crude theology of some of the Methodists. 'What wonder,' he asked, 'Antinomianism is rampant when men, instead of having recourse to the Catholic doctors of the ancient Church, extract their theology from the latest and lowest of our sectaries;[1] if, instead of drawing living water from the fresh springs of primitive antiquity, they take such as comes at second-hand from Geneva, and Clement and Ignatius pass for moderate divines compared to the new lights of the Tabernacle and the Foundry?' In the same spirit, when there was a controversy as to whether it was desirable to bring up children of Churchmen and Dissenters in the same Sunday-school, and conduct them to separate places of worship, he writes, in 1791: 'How can you bring them all up in a Catholic way, unless you have one Catholic, that is, universal, general common religion, in which to bring them up? To be of a Catholic spirit is to unite in that one religion, not to jumble together the errors, inconsistencies, and heresies of all. This must end in indifference. It may bring the people of the Church nearer to the sects; but the present times do not give us any hope that it will bring the sects nearer to the Church.' It is hardly necessary to ask further what Bishop Horne's principles were.

[1] This would not, of course, apply to the Wesleys themselves.

But the man who brought into focus, as it were, those Church principles which certainly had not ceased to exist or to be influential, and changed the scattered band into a compact force, was Bishop Horne's friend, chaplain, and biographer, William Jones, commonly known as 'Jones of Nayland.'

*William Jones* (1726-1800) never rose above the position of a country clergyman, but in more ways than one he exercised greater influence than most of the prelates of his day. Archbishop Secker had the credit of conferring upon him the only preferments of any value he ever held, and the credit is all the greater because the Archbishop merely knew him as the author of 'The Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity.' In 1764 Secker presented him to the vicarage of Bethersden, and in 1765 to that of Pluckley, 'as some reward for his able defence of Christian orthodoxy.' In 1777 he accepted the perpetual curacy of Nayland, and resided there until his death, and hence is generally known as 'Jones of Nayland.' His lifelong friend, George Horne, when he became Bishop of Norwich, made Jones his chaplain. The two were drawn together not only by their Church principles, but because both adopted, to a certain extent, the views of the Hutchinsonians, who, among other things, attempted the hopeless task of upsetting the Newtonian philosophy. These views, however, did not touch any vital point of the faith, while the more spiritual interpretation of Holy Scripture which the Hutchinsonians inculcated took away that little *soupçon* of dryness and hardness which was the weak point of 'the orthodox' party. Jones's writings are most valuable. With considerable humour he defended

the Church, not only in a very able way, but in a way that caught the popular ear; and practically he was a chief leader of the High Churchmen. Nayland Vicarage became a sort of rallying point for them. There was formed in 1792 a short-lived *Society for the Reformation of Principles* by appropriate literature. The result was the foundation of the *British Critic*, the first Church periodical, and the publication of a collection of tracts called 'The Scholar armed against the Errors of the Time,' which was, and might still be, of great use to young students of divinity.

The mantle of William Jones fell upon his friend and biographer, *William Stevens* (1732-1807), who never took Holy Orders, thinking that he could do the Church better service, and that he would be less suspected of interested motives, by continuing a layman. He identified himself with all the agencies for good in which a High Churchman could consistently join, and was indirectly, but very really, the chief cause of fresh agencies being instituted. It was his great delight to gather his friends around him, to consult on Church matters, at his own home; but when the infirmities of age rendered this arrangement inconvenient, these friends formed a sort of club which should meet elsewhere, but of which he should be the chief; hence the formation of '*Nobody's Club*,' or the club of '*Nobody's Friends*.' Stevens gave himself the name of 'Nobody,' having collected, at the solicitation of his friends, his writings, in 1777, and published them in one volume, under the title of *Οὐδενὸς ἔργα*, and having also published a 'Defence' of his friend Jones, under the name of 'Ain,' the Hebrew for 'Nobody.'

*Joshua Watson* (1771-1855) carried on and extended largely the work of Jones and Stevens. Like the latter, he always remained a layman, and became the Robert Nelson of the nineteenth century. There was no scheme of usefulness conducted on Church principles, and scarcely any in which he could join without sacrificing any of those principles, in which he did not take a prominent part. He was one of the founders, and for many years the treasurer, of the National Society; he was treasurer of the S.P.C.K., and bore a leading part in the revival of the energies of that society, which took place in the early years of the nineteenth century; treasurer of the Clergy Orphan School; one of the chief agents in the foundation of the Church Building Society, in 1817-18; while the revived life of the S.P.G. and the rapid rise of the Colonial Church were greatly due to his efforts. He lived a great part of his life at Clapton, and hence the little coterie of which he was the leading spirit was called the 'Clapton Sect,' as distinguished from the 'Clapham Sect.'

It was also called the 'Hackney Phalanx,' because its leading clerical member lived at Hackney. This was *Henry Handley Norris* (1771-1850), who, inheriting a competent fortune, devoted his whole life to the service of the Church without any remuneration worth speaking of. John James Watson, the elder brother of Joshua, was Rector of Hackney, and Joshua's house at Clapton was within five minutes' walk of Hackney Rectory. Norris was J. J. Watson's brother-in-law, and settled at Hackney in 1810 as his curate, until in time the parish was divided, and he became incumbent of the south part of it. He was called 'the Bishop-maker,' because he was sup-

posed to be frequently consulted by Prime Ministers about episcopal appointments.

*Christopher Wordsworth* (1774-1846) was another member of the phalanx, and from his position, as well as from his personal influence, was able to render it service, which it could not obtain from any other quarter; for he was brother of the greatest living poet, chaplain and confidential friend of the greatest ecclesiastical dignitary, and subsequently master of the greatest college in England. Dr. Wordsworth's services to the High Church party have perhaps not been sufficiently appreciated.

Another important member of the group was *Charles Daubeny*, uncle of Mrs. Joshua Watson. Living in the neighbourhood of Bristol, he was too far distant from London to take a prominent part in the good works of which Clapton and Hackney were the centre; but it was a distinct advantage to the Hackney Phalanx to have sympathizers like Daubeny in different parts of the country; and Daubeny rendered such valuable service to the cause by his pen that he was humorously called, after the title of his most famous work, 'The Guide to the Church.'

There was another outpost at Guilsborough, a country living in Northants, held for many years by *Thomas Sikes* (1764-1834), who was nephew of Daubeny, and brother-in-law of the Watsons; and, finally, *Hugh James Rose* (1795-1838), the greatest of all the High Churchmen before the Oxford Movement, though so much younger than the rest of the phalanx, was still a very valuable coadjutor with them.

*Dr. Manners Sutton*, Archbishop of Canterbury,

under the influence, no doubt, of his chaplain, Christopher Wordsworth, was a warm supporter of the party, and rendered it, on more than one critical occasion, aid which the weight of his position made invaluable. It could also claim the full sympathy of the ablest prelate of a past generation, Bishop Horsley, and that of the two ablest prelates of their own generation, Bishop Herbert Marsh and Bishop Van Mildert; indeed, we may say four, for Thomas Fanshawe Middleton had been virtually one of the phalanx when he was Rector of S. Pancras, and continued to be so when he became Bishop of Calcutta. Two judges, Sir John Richardson and Sir James Allan Park; Archdeacons Lyall, Cambridge, Pott, and Bailey; Dean Rennell, and his more famous son, Thomas Rennell; the three Bowdlers; William Kirby, the eminent naturalist; Dr. Routh, the President of Magdalen College; Bishop Randolph of Oxford, and then of London; Dr. D'Oyly and Dr. Mant; Mrs. Trimmer; almost all the Lake poets, and many other famous persons, were more or less in sympathy with the cause. Indeed, without instituting invidious comparisons, it can scarcely be denied that 'Clapton' as far exceeded 'Clapham' in intellectual eminence as 'Clapham' exceeded 'Clapton' in popular influence.

The last part of George III.'s long reign saw the establishment of several Church organizations, the beneficial effects of which remain to the present day.

1. *The National Society* was founded in 1811. From time immemorial the Christian education of the poor had been recognised by the Church as part of her duty. The 'Charity Schools,' which have been already noticed, and which were still flourishing; the educational work done by individual clergymen

in the eighteenth century, which was more extensive than is commonly supposed; the employment of parish clerks to teach children of the lower orders; these are indications that in the deadest period of the Church's history this duty had not been altogether lost sight of. But there now commenced a systematic effort on a large scale. In order to see how it arose, we must go back a few years. In 1787 Dr. Andrew Bell went out to Madras as an army chaplain. He offered his gratuitous services as superintendent of the education of the boys at the Military Orphan Asylum at Egmore, and there originated in 1789 'the Madras System,' the main feature of which was the employment of pupil teachers. On his return to England, he published in 1797 an account of what he had done in Madras, and chiefly through his efforts the Madras System spread widely. But, curiously enough, the same discovery of the advantage of employing pupils as teachers was made by a Quaker called Joseph Lancaster, a little later, but quite independently of Dr. Bell. At first the relations between the two discoverers were perfectly amicable; but in 1805 Mrs. Trimmer sounded the alarm, and certainly not without reason from a Churchman's point of view. It was of the essence of Lancaster's system that distinctive religious teaching was to be excluded from his schools; that teaching was not to be irreligious, but it was to be strictly undenominational. George III. and the Royal Family took Lancaster under their patronage, and in 1808 the *Royal Lancasterian Society* was founded. Hence arose the famous 'Bell and Lancaster controversy,' which resulted in the foundation of the National Society, representing Dr. Bell's

or the Church system in 1811, and of the British and Foreign School Society, representing Mr. Lancaster's or the undenominational system in 1814. The name of the former, with which alone we have to do, arose thus: In 1808 Dr. Bell published a work entitled 'A Sketch of a *National* Institution for training up the Children of the Poor.' On June 13, 1811, Dr. Herbert Marsh, the Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, preached a sermon at the meeting of Charity School children at S. Paul's, entitled 'The National Religion the Foundation of National Education.' The title was taken up by the new society, which was founded in the autumn of the same year, and which set forth in its first report the principle 'that the national religion should be made the groundwork of national education.' After a meeting of three friends, Joshua Watson, Henry Handley Norris, and John Bowles, at Mr. Watson's house, and after much correspondence, a general preliminary meeting was held, October 16, 1811, with the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Manners Sutton) in the chair. At another meeting on October 21 the society was organized and its rules framed. Its success was extraordinary. In one year its work increased fivefold; within twenty years quite a hundredfold.

2. The Indian Episcopate was founded in 1814. In this great work both the Church societies (C.M.S. and S.P.G.), and, we may add, both the High and the Low Church parties, had an honourable share. On the one hand, the Evangelicals, notably Dr. Claudius Buchanan and William Wilberforce, pressed the scheme most warmly. The Indian chaplaincies had

fallen very much into the hands of Mr. Simeon, and the prevailing character of the Church in India was decidedly Evangelical. It could hardly be otherwise, considering how admirably that party was represented in our greatest dependency. Those who were called 'the five chaplains' *par excellence*—that is, David Brown, Henry Martyn, Thomas Thomason, Claudius Buchanan, and Daniel Corrie, all either the nominees or the warm friends of Charles Simeon, were men who could not fail to stamp the impress of their characters and their sentiments most deeply upon the Church in which they laboured. Henry Martyn is, of course, *the* great name to conjure with; nay, it has been termed with pardonable exaggeration 'the one heroic name which adorns the annals of the Church of England from the days of Elizabeth to our own';[1] but all the other four, though their careers were not so sensational, not so striking to the imagination, were quite as eminent and as valuable in their way. On the other hand, the scheme would never have been carried out unless the High Churchmen had taken it up; the work of Christian missionaries had been vehemently opposed as dangerous to our empire, and one of the chief grounds of opposition had been that the Evangelical party, who fell under the fatal suspicion of 'enthusiasm,' was predominant in India. Of course, it all depended on the East India Company, and the feeling in the Council was strongly against Evangelicalism. But the persistent efforts of Dr. Buchanan, and Lord Teignmouth, who could speak and write

[1] 'Essays on Ecclesiastical Biography,' by Sir James Stephen; 'The Evangelical Succession,' p. 336.

with authority, as he had been Governor-General of India, made an impression; and advantage was taken of the renewal of the Company's charter in 1813 to erect their territories into one vast diocese, with an Archdeacon to be resident at each of the three presidencies—Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay. Dr. Thomas Fanshawe Middleton was consecrated first Bishop of Calcutta May 8, 1814. He was a man whose orthodoxy and scholarship were unimpeachable. He had identified himself with the Hackney Phalanx; his character was irreproachable. He had been a most active parish priest, and he was one of the first scholars of the day. The Evangelicals themselves saw this, and loyally accepted Bishop Middleton, High Churchman as he was, in a most Christian spirit. The presence of a Bishop in India gave a new stimulus to mission work. In 1815 the C.M.S. began its mission in Calcutta, and in 1818 the S.P.G. did the same. The Bishop established three circles of mission schools in the neighbourhood of Calcutta, and in 1820 laid the foundation-stone of Bishop's College, of which more will be said in the next chapter.

3. The Church Building Society was founded in 1818. The weakest part of the Church system during the whole of George III.'s reign was its public worship. The want of church accommodation was simply disgraceful to a Christian nation, as statistics abundantly prove. The population had not only increased without any adequate provision being made in church for the increase, but it had also, owing to the spread of commerce, shifted its quarters, and become more concentrated in large

centres. Even the nominal accommodation provided was not generally available, for it largely consisted of proprietary chapels, which in too many cases were commercial speculations, and, as they depended upon pew-rents, virtually excluded the poor. Many efforts had been made during the early years of the century to arouse the Church and the nation to a sense of the shameful destitution of the means of grace which existed ; but so long as the French war lasted, men's thoughts were engrossed with, and their spare money required for, that one object. But in the year 1815, when the war ended, the alarm was sounded by the Rev. Richard Yates, in a letter to Lord Liverpool, bearing the familiar title of 'The Church in Danger.' This letter at once roused an activity which never flagged until it had to a great extent wiped out the stigma which attached to the nation of neglecting to supply men's spiritual needs in what they still called the National Church. The Premier, Lord Liverpool, to whom the letter was addressed, was a good friend of the Church, and, mainly through his influence, a Parliamentary grant of £1,000,000 was voted for church-building. Side by side with this State effort, another effort was made by purely voluntary exertions. This was done through the *Church Building Society*. In 1817 various meetings were held, in which Joshua Watson, John Bowdler, Sir T. D. Acland, and others, took part, and the result was that, at a meeting held at the Freemasons' Tavern on February 6, 1818, with the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Manners Sutton) in the chair, the society was founded. Joshua Watson, aided by the counsel of his relative, Archdeacon

Daubeny, seems to have been mainly instrumental in drawing up its original resolutions.

It will be gathered from the preceding pages that the Church made great progress in the reign of George III., and so it did, as was thankfully owned by those who had its true interests at heart, and who lived long enough to see a vast change for the better. But side by side with this growing efficiency of the Church was a growing odium against it, and that just because it was supposed to be negligent of those duties which, for the first time for nearly a hundred years, it was seriously setting itself to perform. It looks at first sight as if the paradox could only be accounted for by the perversity of human nature. But there is another reason. When men were shrinking with horror from the excesses of the French Revolution, and fearing a similar experience in England, their attachment to the Church was strong because she was a type of all settled institutions. There was a *vis inertiæ* in her very inactivity which constituted an effectual barrier against all dreaded change. In 'the Church and King riots' at Birmingham against Dr. Priestley in 1791, a Church mob arose, as enthusiastic and violent as that in the days of Sacheverell; but when the fear of a revolution passed away, and the French war had also ceased to engross the attention of all, there was leisure to dwell upon the shortcomings of the Church; and, in spite of improvements, those shortcomings were still only too numerous and patent. Before George III. died, the Church reformer had come upon the scene with indictments, sometimes of the most extravagant nature, against an institution which was already declared to be

doomed. The death of the good old King, who, together with his good old Queen, had been the firmest supporter of the Church, gave the signal for a further storm against the Church to arise, which reached the height of its fury after the passing of the Reform Bill.

# CHAPTER XI.

## THE GEORGIAN PERIOD.

*From the Accession of George IV. to the Oxford Movement* (1820-1833).

Accession of George IV. added to unpopularity of Church—Queen Caroline and the Durham episode—'The Black Book'—Roman Catholic Emancipation—Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts—The Reform agitation affected the Church—Strong animus against her—Despondent tone of bishops and others—The Oriel Noetics—Richard Whately—Thomas Arnold—R. D. Hampden—Other Liberals—H. H. Milman—Connop Thirlwall—Julius Hare.

THE accession of George IV. added in more ways than one to the unpopularity of the Church and her ministers. Although, happily, the new King had never posed as a friend of the Church, yet 'Church and King' had so long been associated in men's minds that the misdoings of the latter naturally, though illogically, tended to reflect some discredit upon the former. The very first act of the King placed the Church in a most awkward predicament. George III. died on January 29, 1820, and one of the first royal orders of the new reign was that the name of the Queen Consort should be expunged from the Liturgy. The sympathies of the majority were with the ill-used, if erring, Queen Caroline. But what could the clergy do? Dr. Parr made an interesting record in the Prayer-Book of Hatton

Church after the required erasure: 'It is my duty as a subject and an ecclesiastic to read what is prescribed by my Sovereign, as head of the Church, but it is not my duty to express my approbation.' Possibly many clergy felt the same; but then, unfortunately, their congregations would observe the omission, while they knew nothing about the disapprobation. In 1821 the unhappy Queen died, and then occurred the famous Durham episode. The clergy of Durham were violently attacked in a local newspaper, because 'in an episcopal city, containing six churches besides the cathedral, not a single bell announced the departure of the magnanimous spirit of the most injured of queens.' The writer went on to improve the occasion by abusing the Church system generally: 'It is impossible that such a system can last; it is at war with the spirit of the age, as well as with justice and reason, and the beetles who crawl about its holes and crevices act as if they were striving to provoke and accelerate the blow which sooner or later will inevitably crush the whole fabric, and level it with the dust.' One of these 'beetles' was Henry Phillpotts, afterwards Bishop of Exeter, then Canon of Durham, and the ruling spirit among the Durham clergy. Such a 'beetle' was much more ready to turn than the proverbial worm. Mr. J. A. Williams, proprietor of the *Durham Chronicle*, in which the attack appeared, was prosecuted in the Court of King's Bench. The clergy won their case, but it was a Cadmean victory. The counsel for the defence was the famous Henry Brougham, who carried the *people* with him, though he could not carry the *jury*, and who had, moreover, a terrible weapon in reserve, the *Edinburgh Review*,

which made the incident a convenient peg whereon to hang a savage attack upon the Church in its next number. The Durham incident added much to the already existing odium against the Church.

There was no occasion to add fuel to the flame, which was already burning fiercely enough. There was rising into power a political party whose vital principle was the destruction of the Church as a national establishment. In 1820, just after George IV. succeeded to the throne, a book appeared with the ominous title of the 'Black Book,' the writer of which quite lashes himself into a fury when he thinks of the iniquities of the Church. The violence of the language used would, one might have thought, have carried its own confutation with it. But it was evidently popular; otherwise it would not have been followed some years later by another, which is called 'The Extraordinary Black Book,' quite as abusive as its predecessor. Various events occurred, however, before the latter work appeared.

The death of the old King was the signal for reviving the oft-repeated attempts to repeal the laws which bore very hardly upon Roman Catholics and Protestant Dissenters. The claim of the Roman Catholics to the full rights and liberties of citizens, or, as it was called, 'Catholic Emancipation,' had been a matter of agitation for many years. In 1778 Sir George Saville proposed and carried through Parliament a *Bill for the Relief of English Roman Catholics*, which repealed the iniquitous punishment of priests for conducting the services of their Church, the forfeiture of Roman Catholic heirs, and the debarring of Roman Catholics from the power of acquiring legal property by other means than descent; but this measure,

which simply removed what had been a disgrace to our Statute Book, led to the scandalous 'Gordon Riots.' It is a satisfaction to learn that the bishops, as a body, were in favour of the measure, though they were soundly abused and roughly handled in consequence. After the riots, it was out of the question to attempt anything further for many years, but reasonable men felt that something ought to be done. Pitt took up the matter in 1801, Canning in 1812, Grattan in 1813; but up to the death of George III. the question was complicated by a feeling of loyalty to the good old King, who from first to last set his face against relief, which, he thought, would be a violation of his coronation oath. So, for the matter of that, did his successor; but respect for the father did not extend itself to the son, and the matter again came to the front. In 1825 Sir Francis Burdett proposed a Relief Bill, which passed the House of Commons, but was thrown out by the Lords, and this was one of the few occasions on which the rejection by the Lords of a Liberal measure, sent up to them by the Commons, met with popular sympathy; for Relief was undoubtedly unpopular throughout the country. Churchmen were much divided; many even of the Evangelicals, who were, of course, most opposed to Rome, were yet in favour of relief, while some of the High Churchmen were strongly against it. At last Mr. Peel, the chosen representative of the Oxford Tories and High Churchmen, who had long been an uncompromising opponent of the measure, executed a complete *volte de face*, passed it as a Government measure in 1829, and lost his seat at Oxford in consequence.

The relief granted in one direction was preceded

by relief in another, viz., the *Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts* in 1828, or, rather, those clauses in them which required the holders of civil offices to receive the Holy Communion. The measure of 1828 had not, like that of 1829, been a bone of contention for many years, and its passing did not produce the same practical effects. For the clauses repealed had long been a dead letter, owing to the annual passing of an Indemnity Act, which had virtually given the Dissenters all the privileges which in 1828 they received legally. To the infinite disgust of Lord Eldon and those who followed his lead, some bishops not only voted for the Bill, but also spoke in its favour from a Church point of view. Among these were the Archbishop of York, who said that he expressed the Archbishop of Canterbury's opinion as well as his own, the Bishop of Chester, the Bishop of Durham, and, above all, the Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Kaye).

There was, however, much alarm among many Churchmen about the passing of these measures; and no wonder, considering the *animus* in which they were passed, in the midst of the bitterest attacks upon the Church from various quarters. 'I question,' writes Dr. Stoughton, 'whether in the present day any attacks on any institution are to be compared with those in reference to the Established Church between 1820 and 1830.' The Acts of 1828 and 1829 encouraged the assailants to hope that the days of the 'Establishment' were numbered. The outworks had been taken; it only remained to take the citadel itself. Reform was in the air. The swing of the pendulum had gone back from the violent reaction against all innovation which the

horrors of the French Revolution had caused during the early years of the century; and the shape which reform took in regard to the Church was to sweep it as a National Church from off the face of the earth. In 1824 the *Westminster Review* had been founded, one of the chief writers in which was Mr. James Mill, whose attitude towards the Church is thus described by his son: 'Next to an aristocracy, an Established Church, or corporation of priests, as being by position the great depravers of religion, and interested in opposing the progress of the human mind, was the object of my father's greatest detestation.' Jeremy Bentham wrote a savage attack on all the doings of the National Society under the ungainly title of 'Church of Englandism.' William Cobbett provided similar food for the masses in his *Weekly Register;* the *Penny Magazine* supplied them with the same at the lowest possible cost. The *Edinburgh Review*, which had once been regarded as representing ultra-Liberal views, was now looked upon as a very weak-kneed ally; far more drastic measures were required than its writers had ever dreamed of. The friends of the Church were as despondent as her foes were triumphant. Everybody expected that after the Reform of the State, the Reform of the Church, which meant its destruction as a National Church, would follow as a matter of course. 'The year 1830,' writes Dr. J. B. Mozley,[1] 'ushered in what was perhaps the most memorable and alarming struggle between the Church and her political and Dissenting opponents that had been seen for a century.' The impulse to reform was greatly increased by a second French Revolution,

[1] 'Essays,' vol. ii., 'Dr. Arnold.'

which occurred in this year, and which was carried out without any of the atrocities of the first, and therefore caused no corresponding reaction in England. The worst of it was that Churchmen felt their hands tied; they were ready to correct real abuses, but they were prevented 'by reason,' writes Dr. Miller in this same year 1830, 'of the fierce, ungenerous clamour round about the sanctuary, and the variety of enemies all ready to rush in and build up their own visionary schemes, or schemes of selfishness, upon its ruins.'[1] Two years later Dr. Connop Thirlwall, a keen observer, makes a similar complaint: 'The Church of England contains many disinterested and devoted friends, who perceive its defects, and would wish to remedy them. But the present animosity about its temporal relations to the State so completely engrosses all other subjects connected with it, that it would be absurd in anyone to propose any scheme of internal reformation. The Church remains powerless for any new good, and at the utmost only able to preserve itself from ruin.'[2]

In the interval between these two utterances the animosity against the Church had become very much more embittered, and also more hopeful of making itself felt. The Reform Bill had been passed in the teeth of the bishops, and not without ominous references to what was to follow. The Prime Minister, Earl Grey, had plainly told the spiritual members of the House of Lords that they must 'set their house in order'; Joseph Hume had spoken in the House

[1] 'Sermons,' etc., by John Miller, late Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford, 1830.

[2] Letter to Chevalier Bunsen in 1832. See Thirlwall's 'Letters Literary and Theological,' p. 103.

of Commons about the Established Church as 'a body condemned by the country,' whose 'charter was on the eve of being cancelled by the authority that gave it'; he had 'hoped that these foolish ordinations would terminate,' but he warned 'those young gentlemen who chose to invest their time and property in a condemned building which was admitted on all hands to be not useless only, but absolutely detrimental, that they could expect no more pity than the man who bought the borough of Gatton after the publication of Schedule A.' Bishops had been burnt in effigy; the Bishop of Bristol's palace had been razed to the ground by an infuriated mob; the Bishop of London was warned that it was dangerous for him to preach in a London church, and had actually given up his engagement in consequence; the Bishop of Lichfield was in danger of his life after he had been preaching in London; the Archbishop of Canterbury was mobbed in his own cathedral city. The Reform Bill seemed to have placed the power into the hands of just those who were supposed to be most hostile to the Church and most favourable to Dissent. As it was in the days of Charles I., when the highest and the lowest were for Church and King, but the class between them against both, would it not be so in the days of William IV.?

The bishops themselves evidently thought that it would. There is a tone of despondency about the episcopal charges delivered at this period which shows that they were prepared for the worst. 'When,' said the Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Kaye), in 1831, 'in former times the clergy spoke of the dangers impending over the Church, they were

charged with exciting a cry, of which they knew the falsehood, from interested motives; but now that its adversaries declare it to be in danger, and exultingly tell us that it is tottering to its fall, we cannot be accused of childlike proneness to alarm, if we suspect that their confident anticipations are not merely the suggestion of their wishes, but that they intend their prediction to work its own accomplishment.' 'Four years,' says the Bishop of Lichfield (Dr. Ryder), in 1832, 'must elapse now before we meet again on a similar occasion, and I feel that a more than common uncertainty hangs over such a prospect. If we are spared thus to meet once more in this life, it may be under altered circumstances. But whether the outward state of our *Zion* be prosperous or adverse, may we ever recollect that our vows of allegiance to her, in and through her Divine Head, are upon us, and that we have to be followers of her, as she is of Christ, whether it be through famine, through fire, the sword or the cross. Her altars we cannot desert, her people we cannot abandon.' The Bishop of Durham and other prelates write in quite a similar strain. In fact, in the striking language of Mr. T. Mozley, 'the Church of England was folding its robes to die with what dignity it could.'[1]

But while many were justly alarmed at the danger that threatened the Church from without, there were others, both High Churchmen and Low, who were at least as much alarmed at a danger which seemed to threaten her from within. The thirteen years with which this chapter is concerned produced a large amount of literature (much of it above the

[1] 'Reminiscences of Oriel College,' etc., vol. i., ch. xlii., p. 273.

average in point of intellectual merit) which tended to cut the Church adrift from its old moorings. It was the work of individual clergymen rather than of any party in the Church, and hence it is impossible to treat it *en masse;* it must suffice to touch briefly upon the separate works and their separate writers. The only approach to anything like a party is found in that little group of Oriel men who were called the 'Oriel Noetics'; but even among them it is difficult to find any two men who agreed precisely in their objects, or, at any rate, in their means of attaining those objects. But we shall not be far wrong in giving the first place to *Richard Whately* (1787-1863), who, having published anonymously, in 1819, an admirable little brochure in defence of Christianity, under the title of 'Historic Doubts relative to Napoleon Buonaparte,' was elected Bampton Lecturer in 1822. He chose for his subject 'The Use and Abuse of Party Feeling in Matters of Religion,' and treated it in a manner which certainly differed from that in which either the High or the Low Churchmen of the day would treat it. This he followed up, in 1825, by a work, 'On some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion,' which his old-fashioned readers would consider very peculiar indeed; and this, in 1828, by another, 'On some of the Difficulties in the Writings of S. Paul,' which directly traversed the Evangelical interpretation of S. Paul's epistles. But it was not so much by his writings as by his conversation and his personal influence generally that Whately affected that college which was then intellectually the leading college at Oxford, and which therefore might well be expected to affect the Church at large

in due time. He calls himself, indeed, the disciple of the Provost, Dr. Copleston, but the pupil far eclipsed the master as a leader of thought. The startling intelligence, in 1831, that Dr. Whately had been made an Archbishop produced consternation among all, whether High or Low Churchmen, who did not desire to see the Church so reformed that her old friends would scarcely know her; but it seems to me not unlikely that the removal of Whately to Ireland injured rather than helped the Liberal school, which was supposed to be rising, by the simple fact that it got him out of the way, and left him with other work upon his hands. Whately took with him to Dublin another member of Oriel, Blanco White, who alternated between Romanism and the most ultra rationalism, and whose influence at Oxford was certainly not in the direction which the friends of the Church desired. But the most famous of the Oriel party was *Thomas Arnold* (1795-1842), who, though in my opinion inferior to Whately in intellectual power, was far his superior in the moral influence which he exercised. Dr. Arnold's admirable work at Rugby does not come within our purview; but he felt conscientiously bound to take a part in politics, especially ecclesiastical politics, and his pamphlet on 'Church Reform,' in which he advocated the embracing of almost all Dissenters within a Church which should be founded on an Erastian basis, and in which the distinction between clergy and laity should be virtually obliterated, was too strong even for his friends.[1] It

[1] His old friend, and Provost of his college, Dr. Hawkins, told him with engaging frankness that he was writing on a subject about which he knew little or nothing.

appeared in 1833, and was the last work of any mark on a theological subject before the Oxford Movement began. Another of the Oriel Noetics, *Renn Dickson Hampden* (1793-1868), did not become a prominent personage in the Liberal party until some years after 1833, but he had already written his Bampton Lectures on 'The Scholastic Philosophy considered in its Relations to Christian Theology,' delivered in 1832, and published in 1834.

But outside the Oriel circle there were some who seemed to be aiming at a Church reform from the Liberal side. In 1830 *Henry Hart Milman* (1791-1868), who had already obtained a high reputation as a poet, startled the Church by publishing his 'History of the Jews,' and all the more so because it came out as one of the volumes of Murray's 'Family Library. 'Was it right,' it was asked, 'that an English clergyman should publish for family reading a work which treated the Jews merely as an Oriental tribe, recognised sheiks and emirs in the Old Testament, shifted and classified documentary evidence, and evaded or minimized the miraculous element in the Bible?' The sale of the book was stopped, and the 'Family Library' itself came to an abrupt termination. Perhaps Milman was a little misunderstood; at any rate, he lived long enough to rehabilitate his orthodoxy; but it is not surprising that the 'History of the Jews,' coming out when it did, and in the form that it did, should have created alarm.

Milman, like the rest, was an Oxford man; but Cambridge, too, had its share in the movement. In 1825 was published a translation of Schleiermacher's 'Essay on S. Luke,' with a remarkable introduction

by *Connop Thirlwall*, aided by his friend, *Julius Hare*, both Cambridge residents. This did not create the sensation that might perhaps have been expected; but in 1827 the same two friends published a first instalment of their translation of Niebuhr's 'History of Rome,' which was attacked on the ground that the application of the principles of Niebuhr to Biblical criticism would undermine men's belief in the literal truth of the early Bible history. Hare defended what he had done by publishing in 1829 a 'Vindication of Niebuhr,' fortified by a postscript signed 'C. T.,' and the two friends continued their labours, and accomplished the whole translation in 1832. Hare and Thirlwall had a following of thoughtful young men at Cambridge; and not only at the Universities, but throughout the country, there was a more or less vague impression that, if the Church was to escape destruction, it must be reconstructed on a Liberal basis. How the tide turned will be seen in the next chapter.

# CHAPTER XII.

## THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

(1833-1845.)

The Church tests its strength—Keble's assize sermon—Meeting at Hadleigh Rectory—Association of the Friends of the Church—Clerical address to the Primate and lay declaration of attachment to the Church—The old and the new Church party—The 'Tracts for the Times'—Newman the leading spirit—Recklessness of Newman and Froude—Accession of E. B. Pusey to the party—Death of Froude and publication of his 'Remains'—Keble always for a bold, active policy—Newman's sermons at S. Mary's—His lectures in Adam de Brome's chapel—Hampden made Regius Professor of Divinity—Palmer's 'Treatise on the Church of Christ'—'The Library of the Fathers'—Erection of the Martyrs' Memorial—Newman begins to lose his own footing—Contrast between the antecedents of Keble and of Newman—Tract 80, 'On Reserve,' etc.—Isaac Williams—Tract 89, 'On Mysticism'—Tract 90—Oxford up in arms—Letter of the Four Tutors—Action of the Hebdomadal Board—Tracts stopped at request of Bishop Bagot—The Poetry Professorship—Pusey debarred for two years from the University pulpit—W. G. Ward's 'Ideal of a Christian Church'—Action of Board of Heads in regard to Mr. Ward—Newman's retreat at Littlemore—His 'Essay on the Development of Doctrine,' and his admission into the Roman Church—Others who went over—High characters and attainments of those who remained—The movement in other parts—Camden Society—S. R. Maitland—W. F. Hook—Tales and allegories inculcating the principles of the movement.

It had, as we have seen, been confidently asserted by foes, and mournfully admitted by friends, on all

sides that the days of the Church of England, as a National Church, were numbered; but the question had never yet been definitely put to Englishmen, 'Do you, or do you not, desire to see the Established Church destroyed?' That question was now put, and the answer was an emphatic and stentorian 'No!' None were more surprised at the response than those who asked the question, or, rather, made the appeal, for it was an informal, though very real, appeal to the country. Even in that first flush of Liberalism which followed the Reform Bill, no one would have dared to make such an appeal in the regular way, that is, by making 'the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church' (to anticipate an only too familiar expression of the present day) an election cry. So the Church had no opportunity of testing its real strength until some staunch Churchmen determined to put the matter to a definite issue, and to ascertain, if possible, whether these triumphant prophecies of the Church's enemies, and dismal forebodings of her friends, really meant all that they seemed to mean.

The first call to action was sounded by John Keble in an assize sermon, preached from the University pulpit at Oxford on July 14, 1833. It was published under the title of 'National Apostasy,' and 'I have ever,' writes Cardinal Newman, 'considered and kept the day [on which it was preached] as the start of the religious movement of 1833.'[1] We can easily understand anyone reading this memorable sermon in cold blood, and thinking there was nothing remarkable about it. It had none of the burning eloquence which characterized, say, the splendid

[1] 'Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ,' close of ch. i.

sermons preached by Mr. Keble's co-worker, Mr. H. J. Rose, at the sister University, seven years before;[1] it was simply a calm, brave, outspoken expression of the preacher's conviction of the dangers which beset the Church both from without and from within. So far from being pitched in a despondent key, it expressed the most absolute confidence that all would come right. In the language of the peroration, 'As a true Churchman, he is calmly, soberly, demonstrably sure that sooner or later *his* will be the winning side, that the victory will be complete, universal, eternal.' Like all Mr. Keble's utterances, it was much more effective than might at first be expected; at any rate, it sounded a note of alarm, which was quickly taken up by others. It went far beyond the dangers impending the Church as a national establishment; but this was the first point to be settled.

Strange to say, the centre of interest is now changed from a world-renowned University to an obscure country parsonage in Suffolk. Within a fortnight of the preaching of the assize sermon, on July 25, 1833, there was a meeting of four clergymen at Hadleigh Rectory, then occupied by the brilliant and devoted Hugh James Rose. It did not nearly attain the rank of a ruri-decanal chapter; it was not even of the proportions of the humblest 'clerical meeting.' It included no high dignitary of the Church, consisting simply of four private clergymen,

[1] It will be remembered that Dean Burgon, in his 'Lives of Twelve Good Men,' speaks rather slightingly of Keble's assize sermon, and very enthusiastically about H. J. Rose's Cambridge sermons. See vol. i., 'Hugh James Rose, the Restorer of the Old Paths,' pp. 135, 173, etc.

who met to discuss the affairs of the Church, and to settle upon some plan of action to be adopted for the emergency. They continued their meetings until July 29, and it is not too much to say that the result was an important item in bringing about a change in the whole face of affairs in the Church of England. The names of the four were, Hugh James Rose, the master of the house in which the meetings took place; William Palmer, who had already published his 'Origines Liturgicæ,' one of the many preparatory causes of the Oxford Movement; A. P. Perceval, representative, as Newman says, of 'the Tory aristocracy,' whose name soon drops out of the history, but who, like Mr. (Sir W.) Palmer, has left us an invaluable account of what took place in those early days;[1] and Richard Hurrell Froude, who within three years was called to his rest. Newman had only just returned from his Mediterranean tour. Keble intended to be present, but was prevented by various reasons.[2] Pusey had no connection with the movement at this early date. Of the four present, the Rector of Hadleigh himself was by far the most eminent. It is an idle task to speculate upon what *might have been*, especially for the historian, whose simple duty is to record what actually *was*. It is therefore quite unnecessary to discuss what might have happened if Mr. Rose and Mr. Froude had lived to the allotted age of man. For the present it is enough to say that they were of the memorable four

[1] 'Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833,' by the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval.

[2] See his most interesting reply to H. J. Rose's invitation, given in full by Dean Burgon in his 'Lives of Twelve Good Men,' i. 174.

whose meeting at Hadleigh Rectory was the occasion of the first turn of the tide in the Church's favour. The immediate result of the meeting was the formation of an *Association of the Friends of the Church*, the objects of which were, in the language of Mr. Palmer, the proposer of its formation:

'1. To maintain pure and inviolate the doctrines, the services, and the discipline of the Church—that is, to withstand all change which involves the denial or suppression of doctrine, a departure from primitive practice in religious offices, or innovation upon the Apostolical prerogative, orders and commission of bishops, priests, and deacons.

'2. To afford Churchmen an opportunity of exchanging their sentiments and co-operating together on a large scale.'

Mr. Keble and Mr. Newman, though not present at the Hadleigh conference, were in close correspondence with those who were. There seems to have been from the first a difference of opinion between the three Oriel men and the other three as to the method to be pursued, the former somewhat distrusting the wisdom of associations; but there was no difference as to the object to be aimed at, and it was agreed, first of all, to draw up an address, which was done by Mr. Palmer, for the signature of the clergy, and for presentation to the Archbishop. This address was speedily signed by more than 7,000 clergy, and was presented in February, 1834, to the Primate at Lambeth, who gave the petitioners his cordial support. The clerical address was immediately followed by a lay declaration of attachment to the Church, which was drawn up by Mr. Joshua Watson, and signed by upwards of 230,000

heads of families. 'The Church of England,' writes Mr. Palmer, 'at once rose from her deep depression, and found, to her astonishment, that the nation was unanimous to the old and established faith and worship.'[1] 'From every part of England and every town and city there arose a united, a strong, an emphatic declaration of warm and zealous and devoted loyalty to the Church of England. The national feeling, long pent up, depressed, despondent, had at length obtained freedom to pour forth, and the effect was amazing. The Church suddenly came to life. The journals daily were filled with reports of meetings, in which sentiments long unknown to the columns of newspapers were expressed. . . . The Church, to its astonishment, found itself the object of warm, popular affection and universal devotion. Its enemies were silenced.'[2]

The result was all the more extraordinary because, as has been hinted, there was not perfect unanimity even among the little knot of men who brought it about. Rose, Palmer, and Perceval represented the old High Church party,[3] who had done noble service for the Church before 1833, but who had certainly not succeeded in impressing their views upon the nation at large. Up to that date the Evangelicals had been the dominant party in the Church, and the only other party that seemed at all likely to supersede them was that of the new Liberals, which appeared to be rapidly rising into the first rank. With the

[1] 'Narrative of Events connected with the Publication of the "Tracts for the Times,"' by W. Palmer, pp. 49, 51.

[2] 'The Oxford Movement of 1833,' by Sir William Palmer, in the *Contemporary Review* for May, 1883.

[3] Joshua Watson, who drew up the lay declaration of attachment to the Church, of course belonged to the same party.

insight of genius, Newman saw that if the old Church party (for in the objects at which they aimed he was quite at one with them) was to assert itself and to produce a real impression like that which the Evangelicals and Liberals were producing, it could not be by guarded utterances and carefully-balanced sentences, such as the joint compositions of a committee, where a saving clause is put in to suit one member, and a phrase struck out to suit another, are sure to be. So whilst Palmer, Rose, and Perceval were for 'a board of safe, sound, sensible men,' who would never commit themselves, and never impress themselves, he and Froude were for bolder action. 'Living movements,' he says, 'do not come of committees.' He wanted 'to bring out a living Church of England, made of flesh and blood, with voice, complexion, and motion and action, and a will of its own.'[1] He saw that 'there was something greater than the Established Church—the Church Catholic and Apostolic.' He was not so optimistic as others were; 'our excellent Church establishment' did not altogether appeal to him. He had read with indignation, when he was far away from England with Froude, of the Bill for the suppression of the Irish sees and other exploits of the Liberal party in Church and State, and 'I had fierce thoughts against the Liberals,' he says. When tempted to stay a little longer abroad, 'We have a work to do in England,' he kept repeating; and he gave a significant hint of what that work was to be when he and Froude sent as the motto for the 'Lyra Apostolica,' which first appeared in the *British Magazine*, the words of Achilles when he returned to the battle: 'You shall

[1] 'Apologia,' ch. ii.

know the difference now that I am back again.' They *did* know the difference, and that very soon. On September 9, 1833, he opened fire in the 'Tracts for the Times.' The first few sentences of the first Tract are enough to show that such an appeal could never have come from a committee:

> 'To my brethren in the Sacred Ministry, the Presbyters and Deacons of the Church of Christ in England, ordained thereunto by the Holy Ghost and the Imposition of hands.
>
> 'Fellow-labourers—I am but one of yourselves, a Presbyter, and therefore I conceal my name, lest I should take too much on myself by speaking in my own person. Yet speak I must, for the times are very evil; yet no one speaks against them. Is not this so? Do not we "look one upon another," yet perform nothing? Do we not all confess the peril into which the Church is come, yet sit still each in his own retirement, as if mountains and seas cut off brother from brother? Therefore suffer me, while I try to draw you forth from those pleasant retreats which it has been our blessedness hitherto to enjoy, to contemplate the condition and prospects of our Holy Mother in a practical way, so that one and all may unlearn that idle habit which has grown upon us of owning the state of things to be bad, yet doing nothing to remedy it.'

And then he goes on to enforce with remorseless logic and pointed energy the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession, as that on which the clergy *must* rest their claim to respect and attention. Tract after Tract followed in rapid succession during the

autumn and winter of 1833-4; his friends helped, but Newman was the leading spirit, and the Tracts bore the stamp of his marked personality; that is, the personality of Newman as affected by Froude: for the minds of the two men acted and reacted upon each other. 'Froude and I were nobodies, with no characters to lose, and no antecedents to fetter us. Rose could not go ahead across country, as Froude had no scruples in doing.' This gave Newman and Froude their strength; they could say what they meant without qualification or reserve; they could wake up the Church as men whose positions required them to be cautious and guarded could never have done; they could rush into the fray as free-lances, and could storm positions which would never have been taken by the ordinary rules of warfare. In fact, they *did* do so. The various points for which they contended had all been maintained by the great divines of the reformed Church of England, ranging, say, from Dean Field and Bishop Andrewes at the beginning of the seventeenth century to Bishop Horsley and Bishop Van Mildert at the beginning of the nineteenth. The difference was that they had been ignored, or, at most, had received what Bishop Butler finely terms 'an otiose assent'; Newman and his friends, but Newman far above all, succeeded in making them living, practical realities. No part of the early 'Tracts for the Times' could have been more effective than those 'Catenæ Patrum' which showed in black and white what those who were by almost universal consent regarded as the greatest divines of the Church of England had believed. 'Froude and I' might be 'nobodies,' but Andrewes and Field and Laud and Cosin and

Bramhall and Hammond and Thorndike and Waterland and Butler and Law and Jones and Horsley and Coleridge and Knox and Jebb and Middleton and Van Mildert, were somebodies.

At the same time, it must in fairness be owned that what was the source of their strength was the source also of their weakness. Caution and deliberateness, which they threw to the winds, have their strong sides as well as their weak. We need go no further than Newman's own account of his frame of mind when he was writing the tracts to find a reason why they startled the propriety of the religious world—Orthodox, Evangelical, and Liberal alike. 'I despised every rival system of doctrine, and its arguments, too. As to the High Church and the Low Church, I thought that the one had not much more of a logical basis than the other, while I had a thorough contempt for the controversial position of the latter.' 'When one of my friends of liberal and evangelical opinions wrote to expostulate with me on the course I was taking, I said that we would ride over him and his as Othniel prevailed over Chushan-rishathaim, King of Mesopotamia.' 'I felt great impatience at our being called a party, and would not allow that we were such.' 'I had a lounging, free-and-easy way of carrying things on.' 'I exercised no sufficient censorship upon the Tracts,' and so on.[1] Add to this the influence of Froude, who 'really hates the present state of things so excessively that any change would be a relief to him'—Froude, who 'is most enthusiastic in his plans, and says: 'What fun it is living in such times as these! How could one now go back to the times

[1] See 'Apologia,' ch. ii., *passim*.

of old Tory humbug!'—Froude, who declares that 'if a National Church means a Church without discipline . . . the best thing we can do is to unnationalize ours as soon as possible,' and 'let us tell the truth and shame the devil; let us give up a *National* Church and have a *real* one'; and it is surely not surprising that the joint labours of the two should have brought upon their heads a storm of abuse and alarm. Newman, and, indeed, all the tract writers, were never personal, never scurrilous; they always wrote like Christian gentlemen and scholars as they were; and that in spite of strong provocation, for no name was bad enough for them: they were 'traitors,' 'Jesuits,' 'Oxford malignants,' 'veiled prophets'—nay, 'Thugs.'

Towards the end of 1834 the Oriel men received another provocation from one of their own college. The afterwards famous Dr. Hampden published a pamphlet entitled 'Observations on Religious Dissent with Particular Reference to the Use of Religious Tests in the University,' the practical suggestion of which was the abolition of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles required from members of the University, not on the ground that young men subscribed what they did not understand, but on the ground that 'Creeds were but opinions for which men could not be answerable, and that they were expressed in obsolete phraseology.'[1] This was touching Newman on a very tender point. An Oxford man to the backbone, he always regarded a learned University as the proper centre of any Church movement; but 'since that time,' he writes in his own striking style, 'Phaeton has got into the chariot of the sun; we,

[1] 'Reminiscences chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement,' by T. Mozley, i. 343.

alas! can only look on, and watch him down the steep of heaven. Meanwhile the lands which he is passing over suffer from his driving.'[1] That time, however, had not yet quite arrived. The proposal of Dr. Hampden was rejected in Convocation by a majority of five to one, the majority, it is almost needless to say, being composed of many who had no sympathy in general with the Tractarians, as they now began to be called.

That party received in 1835 an accession which was invaluable, as giving it a status in the University which it had not before possessed. Dr. Pusey had written one of the Tracts as early as December, 1833, but he had carefully guarded himself from identification with the other writers by attaching his initials to it. He now, however, gave in his full adhesion, and worked with the rest, heart and soul. Considering that Keble had already identified himself with the Tractarians, it may seem strange that Newman should have regarded the acquisition of Pusey as the era in which 'a mob' (it is his own expression) was turned into a respectable body, for Keble was eight years older—and years count almost for generations at Oxford—and had perhaps even a higher reputation than Pusey himself. But Keble was away from Oxford; Pusey was on the spot, and so far as sheer learning went was undoubtedly the superior. It is, however, a curious illustration of the fact that Newman regarded it as essentially an *Oxford* movement that he should have attached such vital importance to the adhesion of an illustrious *resident*. The influence of Pusey was at once apparent in the changed character of the Tracts. In fact, they ceased

[1] 'Apologia,' p. 58.

to be Tracts, and became volumes of considerable bulk. Newman, who had not a spark of jealousy in his composition, seems to have acquiesced at once in the leadership of Pusey, and his followers became 'Puseyites,' not 'Newmanites.'

In 1836 occurred an event which had long been expected, the death of 'that brilliant and beautiful Froude,' which affected the movement in more ways than one. Froude had been the link between Keble and Newman, and prided himself on having brought the two together. His fiery energy had acted upon both; he was the dashing spirit, the *enfant terrible*, of the group, the inspirer of the early Tracts. Even when he was in Barbadoes, a dying man, he had by his letters 'kept Newman up to the mark';[1] he represented the opposite pole to that of Pusey, and the advent of the one and the removal of the other naturally made a difference. But Froude, like Samson, made a greater sensation by his death than by his life. The publication of the 'Remains' of Hurrell Froude, for which Keble and Newman were jointly responsible, raised a greater outcry than any of the Tracts had yet done. To read in cold blood the somewhat reckless utterances of a fiery, enthusiastic young man, who was thoroughly dissatisfied with things as they were, was a different thing from listening to them when you saw before you the man who made them, and could take his measure, and succumb to the charms of his personality. If the editors desired to allay the public excitement, they undoubtedly made a mistake in publishing the 'Remains.' But *did* they desire this? Was it not rather their policy to let one who may be called a

[1] Mozley, 'Reminiscences,' i. 346.

representative of the extreme left have his say? Neither Newman nor Keble, least of all Keble, was the man to fall into the error of throwing, as it were, a bombshell into the camp, which was sure to explode, unless he was prepared for the explosion. It is a mistake to suppose that because Keble was shy and humble-minded he was inclined to take the cautious and safe side. Nothing of the kind. Many other instances of his preference for a bold, active policy occur. When Mr. Palmer and those who agreed with him were shocked at the audacity of the early Tracts, and desired to see the series stopped, it was Keble who pressed Newman to go on. When the famous No. 90 was submitted to Keble's approval, he gave it cordially, though he must have anticipated the outcry that would arise; and when that outcry *did* arise, he bravely stepped forward to claim his share in the responsibility for the objectionable publication. And it seems to me that it was in the same spirit that he helped to put forth Froude's 'Remains,' not ignorant, but regardless, of the censure which the work was sure to evoke.

Before we return to the Tracts, another most important agency in forwarding the movement must be noticed. Sunday after Sunday Newman was affecting by the living voice young men who would carry the effects of his teaching into parsonages and pulpits in towns and villages throughout the land. The four o'clock sermons at S. Mary's Church which Newman delivered, as Vicar of the parish, from 1828 onwards, were as powerful a factor as the Tracts themselves. Like Keble's 'Christian Year,' Newman's 'Parochial Sermons' inculcated the principles of the Oxford Movement indirectly rather

than directly, but no less really on that account. And if they are effective when read, and read by men who knew nothing of the man except from hearsay, and who are past the excitable stage of life, what must they have been when heard by youths who knew the preacher personally and honoured him beyond any living man, and who were of the age when mind and soul are most impressible?

Then to the sermons were added the lectures in Adam de Brome's chapel in S. Mary's, which went on from 1834 to 1838. In these Newman set forth more distinctly his views on what he terms the *via media*, which was simply the way of the Church of England as it appeared to the Caroline divines. His 'Prophetical Office of the Church viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism,' published first in 1837, 'Justification,' 'Rationalism and the Canon of Scripture,' and 'Antichrist,' published at different times in 1838, are in fact the lectures he delivered.

In spite, or perhaps in consequence, of the violent opposition which it raised, the Oxford Movement was spreading and thriving in all directions, and Lord Melbourne, the Prime Minister, really played into the movers' hands by appointing Dr. Hampden Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford in 1836. Evangelicals and High Churchmen of the old type were as much alarmed at the appointment as the Tractarians themselves. The general feeling was shown by the overwhelming majority (474 to 94) by which the proposal to deprive the obnoxious Professor of his vote in the choice of select preachers was passed (May, 1836) in Convocation, an assembly by no means favourable to the Puseyites. But it was

powerless to get rid of the Professor, and Newman and his friends could say, 'We told you so. Was it a vain alarm which we raised? Phaeton is now in very truth in the chariot of the sun.'

The two sections of the movement were brought nearer together than they had ever been since the commencement of the Tracts by the publication, in 1838, of Mr. Palmer's learned and exhaustive 'Treatise on the Church of Christ.' This was a work in the commendation of which both sections could agree. It was praised in the *British Critic*, of which Newman had just become the sole editor, as 'the most important theological work which has lately appeared,' and as 'a work quite in character with the religious movement which has commenced in various parts of the Church.'

On the other side, the Palmer party would be thoroughly in sympathy with the magnificent project of Dr. Pusey, to publish a 'Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church anterior to the Division of the East and West,' the prospectus of which had been put forth in 1836, and which was now being carried out under the editorship of Pusey, Keble, and Newman, though a very large share of the work fell upon the learned and saintly Charles Marriott.

Nor do I think that the ingenious proposal made at the end of 1838, to erect the Martyrs' Memorial at Oxford, though it was no doubt intended to force the hands of the Tractarians and make them declare plainly whether they agreed with 'Reformation principles' or not, really injured the movement. In fact, up to the year 1839 it had gone on and prospered far beyond the most sanguine expecta-

tion of its originators. But now came a check; nay, worse than a check, a rift in the lute itself. 'In the spring of 1839,' writes Newman, 'my position in the Anglican Church was at its height.' But, in his after-description of his article on 'The State of Religious Parties,' which he published in the *British Critic* in this same year, he declares: 'These were the last words I ever spoke as an Anglican to Anglicans.' The *movement* was obtaining a firmer footing, but the chief mover was losing his *own* footing. It is beyond our scope to trace out the working of that remarkable mind; but while we read its history, as Newman himself, taking the public into his confidence, lays it bare to us in his own inimitable style, the question occurs, 'Had the Church of his baptism ever had a fair chance of commending herself to one of her noblest and most gifted sons?'

What is meant will, perhaps, best be illustrated by contrasting the antecedents of Newman with those of his friend and coadjutor, John Keble. Keble had been brought up from his earliest childhood in the very atmosphere which it was the object of the Oxford Movement to create. He was from first to last a consistent English Churchman. The principles which he had imbibed from his father at Fairford guided him all through his life. His opinions never radically changed, though they may have developed. He had never any rude shock to bear, never anything to unlearn.[1] He was in the *via media*, though

[1] One who knew him intimately told me that when Keble was asked about the movement, he used to reply, half jocularly, of course: 'I did not know that there *was* a movement,' meaning, no doubt, that it was no movement to *him*.

he knew it not by that name, from the beginning to the end, and was never tempted to diverge from the path either to the right hand or to the left. He was surrounded by pious relatives and friends, whose piety was the outcome of precisely the same system in which he himself had been reared.

But Newman was, intellectually speaking, driven from pillar to post. Brought up in the straitest sect of Calvinism, from which he undoubtedly derived very great spiritual benefit, he gradually outgrew the system. His intercourse with his younger, but very able, precocious and sceptical brother Francis must have been unsettling. He was then thrown into contact at Oriel with Liberalism, from which his soul revolted, as much as his intellect revolted from Evangelicalism. He then painfully groped his way into that *via media*, in which Keble had always walked as a matter of course, and he met with endless abuse and opposition in the process. It is curious to observe how he speaks of hitting upon that *via* as a discovery, which to Keble would be no discovery at all; and still more curious how, after his admission into the Church of Rome, he evidently implies that it was an *ignis fatuus*, a Will-o'-the-wisp, which would never give anyone a firm footing. One can hardly conceive that what Newman wrote in 1864 he would have endorsed in 1894; for the thirty years' interval must have shown him that, though the *via media* had not satisfied *him*, it *has* perfectly satisfied thousands upon thousands who feel that it is not *vera quia media*, but *media quia vera*. The wonderful growth of Anglicanism, which is simply another word for the *via media*, not only in England, but in America, in Australia, in all English-speaking countries, is a

strange comment upon Newman's notion of its untenableness. No! the *via media* theory has not been 'absolutely pulverized,' but circumstances never allowed Newman to give it a fair trial; the beauty and consistency of the Church system was never fairly presented to him. How he drifted from his doubtful moorings will appear in the events to which, after this not unnecessary digression, we may now return.

The outcry against the Tracts, instead of subsiding, grew louder and louder, until it swelled into a frantic scream on the publication of No. 80, 'On Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge.' The title itself—and some of its assailants, including even a Bishop, do not appear to have got beyond the title—was enough to confirm the worst fears that had been entertained. What could be worse, what more unlike S. Paul, than to 'keep back' any part of 'the whole counsel of God,' to reserve some dark secret which was not to be communicated, except to the chosen few? These Oxford Guy Fawkeses had long been suspected of hatching some mysterious conspiracy, and now the truth of the suspicion had come out by the confession of one of their own number!

It may seem grotesque that the man who hurled the firebrand was personally the meekest, the most peaceable, the most limpid of men. Isaac Williams, the writer, belonged, not to the fighting school of Newman and Froude, but to the staid and steady school of the Kebles, who took for their motto 'In quietness and confidence shall be your strength.' He had been the pupil and spiritual son of John Keble, and the curate of Thomas Keble, who now rose in arms to defend him. Though he was after-

wards the curate of Newman at S. Mary's, the two were never quite in sympathy. Williams was dazzled by Newman's brilliancy, and loved and admired him for his many noble qualities, but he evidently thought him 'too clever by half,' and was apprehensive how it might all end.[1] Judging by outward appearances, Williams seemed the last man in the world to fan the smouldering embers of controversy into a flame. But those who go a little deeper into the matter will see that it was quite natural for him to write what he did. Like the Kebles and many other quiet men, he had the courage of his convictions in the highest degree; he had also the delicate, fastidious taste of the refined scholar and pious divine; and one can well understand how his spirit would revolt against the reckless way in which the most sacred and mysterious doctrines of our holy religion were tossed about in the popular theology. He had chapter and verse for his contention that there was a certain reticence—in fact, 'reserve'—about our Blessed Lord's own teaching, until those who were to be instructed were able to bear it. He must have been perfectly well aware that, when he contended against the supposed necessity of introducing the doctrine of the Atonement in its crudest form on every occasion, he was throwing down a gauntlet which crowds would hasten to pick up. But he was quite unmoved by the *furore* which he awakened; he calmly set to work to forge new weapons; and in little more than two years No. 80, which was a 'Tract' (!) of eighty-three pages, was followed by No. 87, a Tract of one hundred and forty-three

[1] See the 'Autobiography of Isaac Williams,' published by his relative, Sir George Prevost, and read between the lines.

pages (exclusive of elaborate notes) in which he retracted not one word of what he had written before, characterized what had been written against it as 'mere vague declamation,' and recommended the *disciplina arcani* more strongly than ever.

After a harmless Tract, No. 88, which was simply 'The Greek Devotions of Bishop Andrewes translated and arranged,' came No. 89, whose very title again roused the slumbering lion—'On the Mysticism attributed to the Early Fathers.' Those who had been exasperated by the word 'Reserve' would be equally exasperated by the word 'Mysticism.' It was all of a piece: first, something was to be kept back from them; then they were to be mystified! Plain John Bull strongly objected to such treatment. This time John Keble himself was the offender; but one would have thought that here, even more than in the Tracts about Reserve, men must have stumbled at the mere title, for it is hard to see what there is in the beautiful and suggestive Tract, which was afterwards published separately, and filled a fair-sized volume, to create such a panic. It is to a great extent an amplification of the theory put forth in the hymn for Septuagesima Sunday ('There is a book, who runs may read'), showing how the Fathers believed that 'things were double one of another,' and that 'the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made.'

But the cup of public indignation was not full until the appearance of No. 90, in the spring of 1841. It is difficult to help reading between the lines of this notorious Tract. The writer was Newman himself, who has told us that two years

before he had 'spoken his last word as an Anglican to Anglicans.' The obvious inference would be that when he contends that the Thirty-nine Articles are 'patient of a Catholic interpretation,' and that they do not necessarily involve a condemnation of all Roman dogmas, he is simply paving the way for the journey of himself and others to Rome. I believe that, as a matter of fact, the exact reverse was the case. When Newman speaks about 'his last word,' he does not mean that he knew at the time that it was 'his last word.' No! he was *then* still clinging tenaciously to the English Church; he observed with alarm that there was an evident tendency on the part of some of his late disciples to move Romewards; he had an uncomfortable suspicion that he himself was moving slowly, slowly in the same direction. And so, to keep himself and them steadily and logically within the pale of the English Church, he wrote Tract 90, 'Remarks on Certain Passages in the Thirty-nine Articles.' He could certainly make out a strong case, both historically and from the practice of his fellow-Churchmen of different types, for his contention. The first five Articles—'the doctrinal articles'—were of course *de fide*. But was it not a historical fact that others were purposely drawn up in general terms in order to embrace men of different schools of thought? If a certain elasticity was not admitted, could the Liberal, could the Evangelical, be consistent in signing them? And if a latitude was given to *them* in one direction, why not to the High Churchman in another? 'Two can play at that' was an expression that was frequently in Newman's mouth. He indignantly denied that he ever recommended the interpretation of the

Articles 'in a non-natural sense,' as he was accused of doing; but he *did* contend for as wide an interpretation as possible, on the ground that it was an absolute necessity, if the Church was to keep within her fold Liberals and Evangelicals no less than High Churchmen. It was a piece of special pleading, ingenious, clever, and not easy to be answered point by point. But it gave a handle to the enemies of the movement, which could be turned more effectively than any former handle could have been. Oxford was up in arms. The Tract was published on February 27. On March 8, four senior tutors,[1] among whom was a future Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote to the editor, who was soon known to be also the writer, 'charging him with suggesting and opening a way by which men might, at least in the case of Roman views, violate their solemn engagements to their University.' On March 15 the Hebdomadal Board, which consisted of Heads of Houses, decided that 'modes of interpretation such as are suggested in No. 90, evading, rather than explaining, the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors which they are designed to counteract, defeat the object, and are inconsistent with the due observance of the University statutes.'[2] Newman was not allowed to explain his meaning, and he felt that his place in the University was gone. But a sense of fair play rallied round him men like Dr. Hook, Mr. Palmer and Mr. Perceval, who had been somewhat alienated from

[1] The four were: Mr. Tait, of Balliol; Mr. H. B. Wilson, of S. John's; Mr. Churton, of Brasenose; and Mr. Griffiths, of Wadham.

[2] See Dean Church's 'Oxford Movement,' pp. 252, 253.

him before. The action of the University certainly defeated its own end, if that end was to stop the movement, or to prevent secessions to Rome. The direct result was to bring the truly Anglican supporters of it more closely together, and to give a strong impetus to the Romanizers in the direction in which they were tending. The Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Bagot), of whose kindness and consideration Newman always speaks in the warmest terms, requested that the series of Tracts might come to an end, and Newman instantly obeyed without a murmur. They had done their work, and no amount of opposition, either from officials or from private individuals, could undo it, or check the wonderful progress which the movement was making.

During the four eventful years which elapsed between the abrupt termination of the Tract series, and the secession of its great originator and editor to Rome, the same policy was pursued by the University authorities, with the same result.

In the autumn of 1841, John Keble resigned the Professorship of Poetry, and under ordinary circumstances there could have been but one man who would have commended himself to the electors to fill the post. Mr. Isaac Williams, the author of 'The Cathedral,' 'The Altar,' etc., was the obvious successor of the author of 'The Christian Year.' He was an Oxford resident, a scholar and divine, and a man of pure and elevated character; and it was known that Mr. Keble, who had filled the chair with conspicuous success, and had therefore a claim to be heard, earnestly desired that Mr. Williams should succeed him. But Mr. Williams was also the writer of the Tracts on 'Reserve'; and the

*odium theologicum* came in. Another candidate was brought forward, Mr. Garbett, a man of mark, but in no way specially connected with poetry; and on a comparison of votes, it was found that Mr. Williams would have had no chance of election.

Then followed an attempt by the Regius Professor of Divinity, Dr. Hampden, to deprive another member of the party, Mr. Macmullen of C.C.C., of his degree of B.D., by forcing him to defend, in the exercise for that degree, a thesis which his well-known principles could not possibly allow him to defend. The attempt was successful only for a time; but it showed a spirit which was sure to create a reaction in the ingenuous minds of the younger generation.

In 1843 still higher game was struck at. Dr. Pusey preached a sermon from the University pulpit on 'The Holy Eucharist as a Comfort to the Penitent,' which was intended to be a sort of balance of the somewhat severe views which he had expressed in his Tracts on 'Post-Baptismal Sin.' The sermon was delated to the Vice-Chancellor, and referred by him, according to statute, to six Doctors of Divinity, who condemned it without giving any reason (as, indeed, they were not bound to), and Dr. Pusey was forbidden to preach in the University pulpit for two years. Though it was known that one of the doctors who had sat in judgment was the delator himself, Dr. Pusey had no alternative but to submit to the sentence, for there was no appeal. At the end of the two years he quietly took up, by the advice of John Keble, the subject again, and re-asserted, without rebuke, in 1845 what he had been punished for asserting in 1843.

Then came the case of Mr. W. G. Ward, who was the most outspoken and extreme of that party in the movement which really was drifting towards Rome. Mr. Ward's articles in the *British Critic*, in which he showed his Roman sympathies and his Anglican antipathies without disguise, struck with dismay those who were sincerely loyal to the English Church. Mr. Palmer wrote his 'Narrative of Events connected with the publication of the "Tracts for the Times"' to show that the articles in the *British Critic* were quite contrary to the original intention of the movement. But in 1843 the *British Critic* came to an end, and Mr. Ward replied to Mr. Palmer in an able and bulky volume entitled 'The Ideal of a Christian Church as compared with Existing Parties.' There could be no mistake about his opinion, that the Church of Rome approached more nearly to his 'ideal' than the Church of England did; in fact, the writer seems to have a positive dislike of everything distinctly Anglican. He had no hesitation in avowing that he could subscribe to one of the Articles (the 12th), only in 'a non-natural sense,' the very course which Mr. Newman has been unjustly accused of recommending in No. 90. He exulted in the fact that he and others could and did hold 'the whole cycle of Roman doctrine,' and yet retain without censure their positions in the English Church; he utterly repudiated the distinction between 'Roman' and 'Catholic' teaching; he would have nothing to do with the *via media*.

If the Board of Heads had been content to condemn the book, they would have had the majority of High Churchmen, and of course all the Evangelicals and Liberals, on their side; if they had added to

this the degradation of the writer from all his degrees, they would not have carried so many (for Mr. Ward was deservedly a most popular man), but still they would have carried a great number with them. But they added a third proposal, which amounted to nothing less than the imposition of a new test, and in December, 1844, announced their intention to submit all three measures to Convocation.[1] There was naturally an outcry against the third proposal, and it was withdrawn; but the Board thought it a favourable opportunity of reaching the *fons et origo mali*, by attacking the master through the disciple. They proposed a censure of No. 90, which had been published four years before, Mr. Ward's reference to the famous Tract in his 'Ideal' giving them a pretext for attacking it; but upon this public opinion made itself felt. There were many who loved and honoured Mr. Newman outside Oxford, and these brought their influence to bear. The matter was quashed by the interposition of the Proctors' veto. Never, perhaps, was there a more memorable meeting of the Oxford Convocation than that of February 13, 1845, when the proposal to condemn No. 90 was met

[1] The three measures were: (1) To condemn Mr. Ward's book; (2) to degrade Mr. Ward by depriving him of all his University degrees; (3) 'Whereas the existing statutes gave the Vice-Chancellor power of calling on any member of the University at any time to prove his orthodoxy by subscribing the Articles, to add to this a declaration to be henceforth made by the subscriber, that he took them in the sense in which "they were both first published and were now imposed by the University," with the penalty of expulsion against anyone, lay or clerical, who thrice refused subscription with this declaration.' See Dean Church's 'Oxford Movement,' ch. xviii., pp. 326, 327.

with the words 'Nobis Procuratoribus non placet.' The senior Proctor was Mr. Guillemard, of Trinity; the junior, Mr. Church, of Oriel, from whose accomplished pen half a century later appeared (alas! posthumously) a history of the Oxford Movement which will be an English classic.

Meanwhile, where was the great master-spirit who had been the most prominent figure in the Oxford Movement since its rise, twelve years before? From his retreat at Littlemore Newman watched with a sort of grim irony the doings at Oxford, three miles away, but took no part in them. We know from his inimitable autobiography, and from his heart-rending letters to his friends published many years later, that he was still lingering on the bank, hesitating, not *whether*, but *when*, he should make the fatal plunge. Instead of luring his friends on to the brink of the precipice, as was once supposed, he was, in fact, rather pushed on by them. He was not allowed quietly to pursue the workings of his own mind, but was pressed by questions which he would rather not have answered. He had never recovered from the shock which the Anglo-Prussian scheme of appointing a Protestant Bishop for Jerusalem, four years before, had caused him. It cut at the root of his most cherished theory. How could the Anglican Church be any longer regarded as a part of the Church Catholic, when its leaders, including the Archbishop of Canterbury himself and the Bishop of London, not only sanctioned, but were mainly instrumental in bringing about, a schismatical act? There was already a lawful Bishop of the Greek Church in Jerusalem; any other Bishop there must be an uncanonical intruder; and

in course of time there would be a Bishop actually appointed by Lutherans; for by the arrangement agreed upon, England and Prussia were to appoint alternately.[1] Grave doubts about the catholicity of the English Church had haunted him before, but this scheme of the Jerusalem bishopric changed those doubts into certainties. 'It was one of the blows that broke me.' For what if the English Church were not catholic? 'Securus judicat orbis terrarum.'

But if the English Church had not the note of catholicity, which Rome had, surely she had the note of antiquity, which Rome had not. 'They [the Romans] have no support in the Fathers, sir. In the first three centuries, not one word,' said Dr. Routh, the best-read man at Oxford.[2] Newman was quite clear-sighted enough to perceive the force of the objection; but he found a way out of the difficulty. Was there no such thing as a development of doctrine? Had not Christ promised to be with His Church *all the days*, even to the end of the ages? Might not, therefore, the changes of a later day be as much His doing as the decisions of an earlier? I have used, almost unconsciously, the word 'changes,' but herein seems to me to lie the fallacy of the argument. Changes are one thing, development another. A development in doctrine or practice must be in the same direction as the original; a change may be in a different direction. Surely many of the differences between the mediæval and the early Church are

[1] This actually happened very shortly. In 1846 Bishop Alexander died, and Bishop Gobat was appointed by Prussia.

[2] See Burgon's 'Lives of Twelve Good Men,' p. 56.

changes, not developments.[1] However, Newman was spending those quiet months in elaborating, perhaps as much for his own satisfaction as for that of others, his theory; and he apparently satisfied himself, for in October, 1845, the 'Essay on the Development of Doctrine' appeared, and in the same month 'he was admitted into the Catholic Church by Father Dominic, the Passionist,' the event being announced in the 'Advertisement' to the 'Essay.'

The result had, of course, been expected; but it came like a shock at the last. The chiefs of the Roman section of the movement, Mr. Oakeley, Mr. Ward, Mr. Faber, Mr. Dalgairns and others, went over, sooner or later, with their leader to Rome, and on a further provocation a few years later there was a further secession. The Church of England lost some singularly brilliant and pious sons; but those who remained will more than bear comparison in point of numbers, learning, and sound judgment with those who left us. With such names as Dr. Pusey, the two Kebles, the two Mozleys, George Moberly, Isaac Williams, Charles Marriott, Richard Church, Copeland, Prevost, Woodgate, Haddan, and Hook, still among her sons, surely even Oxford need not have 'despaired of the Republic.' If anyone can be said to have taken the place of Newman at Oxford, it would be Charles Marriott, a man of a singularly different type of character, but one who had a marked influence, which has perhaps scarcely been appreciated at its worth. But after the secession of Newman, the

[1] 'In a true development all that is developed must have been implicit in germ before it became explicit in unfolding.' —'Thoughts on Christian Reunion,' by the Bishop of Ripon (Dr. Boyd Carpenter), ch. vii., p. 188.

influence of the movement at Oxford was decidedly lessened, while at the same time in other parts of the country it was decidedly enlarged.

But even during the twelve years when it was emphatically 'The Oxford Movement,' the revival was going on and the great controversy raging elsewhere. For instance, in a quieter, but no less real way, it was going on at Cambridge. The work of the Cambridge Camden, afterwards called the Ecclesiological, Society, under the vigorous management of E. J. Boyce, J. M. Neale, Benjamin Webb, E. Venables, and other older though less prominent men, is one instance. The lectures, again, of J. J. Blunt, the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and the sermons of such men as W. H. Mill and Le Bas, who followed in the wake of Christopher Wordsworth the elder, H. J. Rose, and other High Churchmen of the old type, helped to make Anglicanism a power in the midst of the dominant Evangelicalism.

Still more effective were the writings of another Cambridge man, who, however, had no further connection with Cambridge than from the fact that he took his degrees there. Scant justice has been done to the services which were rendered to the Church revival by *Dr. S. R. Maitland* (1792-1866). His name is hardly mentioned in any of the popular accounts of the Oxford Movement. Perhaps this is not surprising, because he distinctly 'declined to follow them [the Tractarians] in their later developments,' and published in 1841 'A Letter to a Friend on the Tract for the Times, No. 89,' which rendered him an object of suspicion to them; and, so far from regretting what he had written, he republished his 'Letter' as one of 'Eight Essays on Various Sub-

jects,' in 1852. But his vast and accurate knowledge of history, in which he was far superior to any of the Tract writers, enabled him to do service to their cause which no one else did or could do. 'I thought,' writes Dr. Newman, 'that the Anglican Church was tyrannized over by a mere party' ('Apologia,' ch. iii.), meaning the Protestant party generally. Now, no one helped more to shake that tyranny in one most important department, that of history, than Dr. Maitland. He traversed their accepted theories on the Albigenses and Waldenses as precursors of the reformed Church of England, on the trustworthiness of Fox, the martyrologist, and of Milner, as a Church historian, on the utter darkness as to religion and literature of 'the Dark Ages' (that is, from the beginning of the ninth to the close of the twelfth century), on Archbishop Cranmer as represented by Strype, on the English Reformation generally and the Ribalds in particular. Of course his views were vehemently opposed, but those who ventured to attack him found that they had a very formidable antagonist to contend with, and, so far as I am aware, no one could really answer him. Many of his writings on these subjects appeared in the *British Magazine*, between the years 1835 and 1848 (the first assault on the Albigenses and Waldenses in 1832)—that is, just during the time when the Oxford Movement was making its influence felt. He was an intimate friend of the brilliant editor of the magazine, Hugh James Rose, and on the death of Rose, in 1839, succeeded to the editorship, which he retained until the discontinuance of the magazine in 1849. His style was clear and attractive, and I doubt whether

anyone did more to draw men's minds from the Puritan to the Catholic view of ecclesiastical history than Dr. Maitland.

In the country, W. F. Hook, who had imbibed his Church principles quite independently of, and, indeed, long before, the Oxford Movement, was making the Church a real power in the important centre of Leeds, having already made his mark at Coventry. In all parts of the country the disciples of Newman and Pusey were spreading the principles of their leaders in towns and villages; and in two dioceses at least, Salisbury and Exeter, there were bishops who were more or less in sympathy with the Oxford School.

But perhaps the most potent influence of all in spreading these views far and wide was the press, and that in rather a humble form. The elder reader will probably connect the names of Dr. J. M. Neale, Mr. Gresley, Mr. Paget, Miss Sewell, with popular tales which delighted him in his youth, and he will also not have forgotten that a new set of allegories, written by S. Wilberforce, W. Adams, and Edward Monro, was taking the place of the old 'Pilgrim's Progress' and 'Holy War.' People who would never have dreamed of reading the 'Tracts for the Times' read with avidity 'The Siege of Lichfield,' 'Amy Herbert,' 'The Owlet of Owlston Edge,' 'The Rocky Island,' 'The Shadow of the Cross,' 'The Dark River,' and imbibed from them, perhaps half unconsciously, the principles which it was the object of the Tracts to impart. But such works, appealing chiefly to the young, would not have their full effect until the period which will be dealt with in the next and final chapter.

# CHAPTER XIII.

## THE CHURCH IN THE VICTORIAN ERA AFTER THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

Difficulties of writing contemporary history—A period of controversial and practical activity—The 'Puseyite' Controversy—The Hampden Controversy—The Gorham Controversy—Fresh migrations to Rome—Papal hierarchy in England and Ecclesiastical Titles Bill—Changes in the Final Court of Appeal—Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—Rise of ritual disputes—Bishop Blomfield's Charge in 1842—Surplice Riots—S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and S. Barnabas, Pimlico—Westerton *v.* Liddell—Ditcher *v.* Denison—Riots at S. George's-in-the-East—'Essays and Reviews'—Bishop Colenso and Bishop Gray—Case of Mr. D. B. Heath—Of Mr. C. Voysey—'Ecce Homo'—Agitation about the Athanasian Creed—Report of Ritual Committee of Convocation on 'the Six Points'—Royal Commission on Ritual—Martin *v.* Mackonochie, and Flamank *v.* Simpson—Purchas Judgment of 1871—Ornaments rubric—Dismay at the Judgment—Public Worship Regulation Act—Reasons for alarm about the Act—The Ridsdale case—F. D. Maurice—Salient points of his teaching—'Eternal life'—Distinction between the Catholic Faith and popular glosses upon it—Maurice's nebulousness—His attractive personality—His practical work—C. Kingsley—'Muscular Christianity'—Influence of Maurice and Kingsley on all parties in the Church—Their friends and followers—A. P. Stanley and the Rugby men—Ecclesiastical Commissioners—Tithes Commutation Act—Church restoration—Church system followed out—Psalmody—Improvement in Cathedral work—Use of Cathedral naves for popular services—Redistribution of Cathedral revenues—Utilization of residentiaries—Activity of bishops—Subdivision of dioceses—Revival of

suffragan bishops—Means of special training for the clergy—Episcopal Act of 1836—Cathedral Act of 1840—Pluralities Act of 1838—Peel districts—Pastoral Aid Society—Additional Curates Society—Westminster Spiritual Aid and Bishop of London's Funds—The Church's work in elementary education—In secondary education—Mission work at home and abroad—Increase of Colonial and missionary episcopate—Pan-Anglican conference—Parochial missions—Revival of Convocation—Houses of laymen—Church congresses—Diocesan conferences—Sisterhoods—Church of England Temperance Society—White Cross Society—General features of the National Church—Hopefulness for the future.

We are now passing from the stage of history to that of contemporary recollection. But while nothing is more valuable to the maker of history than the personal reminiscences of contemporaries, nothing is more misleading than the generalizations of contemporary historians. They stand, as it were, too near the actors to be able to gain a proper perspective, and so are apt to draw their pictures out of proportion; the most far-seeing are apt to mistake the real tendency of events, for matters which seem to be the most important at the time do not turn out to be so in the end. Having found this to be the case by painful experience, I shall only touch very lightly upon that period of the Church's history which followed the Oxford Movement—not because it is an unimportant period, for it is the most important of all, but because a contemporary is not the fit person to judge of it aright. Simple facts, however, are enough to show that it has been a period of extraordinary activity both in Church controversy and in Church work. Unlike the early Georgian era, when the various controversies—the Deistic, the Trinitarian, the Bangorian, the Nonjuring, and

countless minor ones which sprang out of them—so occupied the attention of Churchmen that they forgot the practical work of the Church, the period before us has been no less active in practical work than in settling, or striving to settle, great questions of controversy. Let us take the controversial aspect of the age first.

1. There was the *Puseyite Controversy*. We have seen that up to the autumn of 1845 Oxford had been the centre of the movement. But after that time, though there was still a compact party at Oxford, which was relieved rather than weakened by the withdrawal of those who had been really tending Romeward from the very first, yet the general interest was by no means concentrated in Oxford, as it had been. The movement was spreading far and wide, creating the most frantic opposition, but yet steadily making way. To call a man a 'Puseyite' was in many circles equivalent to calling him a rascal, a traitor, a man who was in heart a Romanist, while he was eating the bread of the Church of England. Each fresh secession to Rome of course added force to the charge. The seceder had only carried out his principles to their logical result, and those who remained were urged to go and do likewise. Dr. Pusey, in his famous letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1841, quoted from memory a remarkable prophecy of Mr. Sikes, of Guisborough, to the effect that 'there was then a universal want of definite teaching on the subject of the Holy Catholic Church,' but that 'as soon as that doctrine should be prominently brought to the front, which he thought would not be in his day, but very soon afterwards, the result would be at first

endless misunderstanding and one great outcry of Popery from one end of the country to the other.' Never was there a prediction more literally fulfilled. Bishops charged, clergy preached, pamphleteers wrote, congregations protested, mobs shouted against the doctrines and practices of the Oxford School, of which it required an amount of moral courage difficult to realize at the present day for a man to avow himself an adherent. Doctrines which would now be regarded almost as commonplaces of Church theology, and usages which are now almost universal, were then regarded with suspicion and alarm as inevitably tending to Rome.

2. Matters were somewhat complicated by a revival of the *Hampden Controversy* in an aggravated form. In December, 1847, on the translation of Bishop Musgrave to the archbishopric of York, the Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, nominated Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford. The appointment was objected to by many who were not 'Puseyites.' Thirteen bishops—and there were certainly not thirteen on the Bench who sympathized with Puseyism—presented an address of remonstrance to the Prime Minister, while, on the other hand, fifteen Heads of Houses at Oxford gave Dr. Hampden a sort of testimonial of orthodoxy. Before Hampden's election by the Chapter of Hereford, the Dean (Dr. Mereweather) informed the Premier of his intention to vote against the election, and received this curt reply:

'SIR,

'I have had the honour of receiving your letter, in which you intimate to me your intention of violating the law.'

The Dean carried out his intention, he and one

Canon voting against the election. At the Confirmation at Bow Church, January 11, 1848, there was an opposition, which was overruled; the opposers applied to the Court of Queen's Bench for a mandamus to force the Archbishop of Canterbury to listen to them, and obtained their rule; judgment, however, was given against issuing the mandamus, and Dr. Hampden was duly consecrated. The whole case fills an octavo volume of 500 closely-printed pages (drawn up by Mr. Jebb, Q.C.); but the *literature* on the subject would have filled many such volumes. Petitions, chiefly drawn up by Tractarians, but signed by many who would not come under that designation, were circulated throughout the country, and for a time the Hampden question was the great question of the day. But it soon passed out of notice, and Dr. Hampden settled down into a very quiet Bishop.

3. Perhaps one reason of its subsidence was that Churchmen's attention was diverted from it to the famous *Gorham Controversy*. At the very time when the Hampden appointment was announced, the Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Philpotts) was subjecting to a searching examination the Rev. G. C. Gorham, whom he was called upon to institute to the vicarage of Brampford Speke, in his diocese. It should be mentioned that thirty-six years before, in 1811, the then Bishop of Ely (Dr. Damphier) had felt some scruples about admitting Mr. Gorham to Holy Orders, on the ground of his unsoundness on the subject of Baptismal Regeneration. This was the very subject on which Bishop Philpotts, exercising his undoubted rights, subjected Mr. Gorham to two long examinations, one in December, 1847, another

in March, 1848. Not considering his answers satisfactory, the Bishop refused to institute him. The case was tried, first in the Court of Arches, where the judgment of Sir Herbert Jenner Fust was given (August 2, 1849) in favour of the Bishop. Mr. Gorham then appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, who reversed the judgment of the Court of Arches (March 8, 1850). The Bishop appealed, first to the Court of Queen's Bench, then to the Court of Common Pleas, and then to the Court of Exchequer; but all three courts decided that the appeal from the Court of Arches was to the Judicial Committee, and refused the Bishop's application. So on August 6, 1851, Mr. Gorham was instituted by the Dean of Arches, acting for the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the vicarage of Brampford Speke.

The grievance of High Churchmen was not so much the doctrinal as the constitutional question. They held that the Judicial Committee was a lay court, and was not competent to decide on spiritual questions. The Hampden and Gorham cases, but especially the latter, caused a fresh migration to Rome, the most famous men who went over being Archdeacon Manning, afterwards Cardinal and titular Archbishop of Westminster; Dr. Allies; Mr. Maskell, who, as chaplain to the Bishop of Exeter, had conducted the examinations of Mr. Gorham; Mr. Dodsworth, the friend and coadjutor of Dr. Pusey; and, a little later, Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce, perhaps the most lovable and learned of that remarkable family.

It was no doubt in consequence of these secessions and of the general unsettlement of men's minds in

consequence of the Hampden and Gorham cases, that the Pope, Pius IX., in the autumn of 1850, took the bold step of establishing a Papal hierarchy in England. He issued a Bull making England a province of the Roman Catholic Church, divided the country into dioceses, and appointed Dr. Wiseman Archbishop of Westminster and head of the mission. This caused the wildest excitement. Lord John Russell, nothing loath, introduced and passed through Parliament an *Ecclesiastical Titles Bill*, which forbade the assumption of any title by Roman Catholic bishops taken from any places in the United Kingdom. The Roman Catholics simply ignored the measure, which, after having become practically a dead letter, was repealed in 1871.

The Gorham case was the first of a long series of cases in which clergymen were tried for matters connected with doctrine or ritual before tribunals the validity of which many Churchmen could not conscientiously accept. It was most unfortunate that just before that movement which above all things taught the Church to realize her position as a divinely-appointed, spiritual society, quite apart from her national establishment, a change had been made in the Final Court of Appeal in matters of doctrine and ritual. When the National Church broke off from the Roman obedience in 1534, the final resort was henceforth to the Sovereign instead of the Pope. The Sovereign gave his or her decision through a Court of Delegates which might, and generally did, consist to a great extent of spiritual persons. But in 1832 the final appeal was transferred, simply by Act of Parliament, without the consent of Convocation, which

then existed only in name, from the Court of Delegates to the Privy Council—that is, from the King in Chancery to the King in Council. In 1833, by a kind of accident,[1] it passed to a section of the Council called the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. This was a purely secular court, founded by a purely secular authority. Not a single ecclesiastic was necessarily included in it; not a single member of it was necessarily even a member of the Church of England. It was, in the view of High Churchmen, a usurpation by the temporalty of the proper functions of the spiritualty. They contended that the obvious teaching of our Blessed Lord Himself, the universal practice of the Church in all ages and in all places, was that spiritual questions should be decided by spiritual persons; that the strongest assertions of the royal supremacy had always been modified by the qualification that temporal princes should not decide upon spiritual matters; and that even if archbishops and bishops consented to abdicate their rights and to insist upon obedience to the civil courts, this did not alter the law of the Church, which Churchmen were bound to obey. It did not at all satisfy their scruples that prelates might in certain cases attend as assessors, not as members; 'the attendant bishops,' said Canon Liddon, one of the most distinguished members of the party, 'only decorated by their presence a tribunal which was essentially civil and lay; they lent to its decisions a semblance of ecclesiastical authority which it could not in fact possess, and

[1] See 'The Civil Power in its Relations to the Church,' by J. Wayland Joyce, p. 16, etc.

which was only calculated to embarrass tender consciences.'

It is necessary to put this very plainly, because at the first blush it would seem that the clergy who rebelled against the decision of the highest court of the realm, and against the wishes of their bishops in many instances, desired to be a law unto themselves. But this was not the case. Rightly or wrongly, they believed that in disobeying a lower they were, in fact, obeying a higher law.[1] This, it is hoped, having been made clear, we may proceed to consider a few of the chief cases of ecclesiastical litigation in which either doctrine or ritual was concerned.

The Oxford Movement had not touched directly upon ritual questions, but the inevitable result of it had been to bring such questions to the front. For it had laid the greatest stress upon public worship, and the worship of the Church of England was ruled in theory by the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer. In theory, but not in practice. Were those who had complained most loudly that Mr. Newman and his friends were unfaithful to the Church, faithful to it themselves? Were such plain injunctions as those concerning the daily service,

[1] As generally happens, a reaction was provoked, and some went so far as to say that the Civil Power should have no control over any part of the action of the Church. But the head of the party, Dr. Pusey, was too well read a man to agree with this view, and to correct it he published his valuable fragment on 'The Royal Supremacy,' in which he showed that this was not so, even in spiritual affairs, though the voice of the Church should be heard (see Liddon's 'Life of Pusey,' iii. 341, etc.). Dr. Pusey thoroughly agreed that the laity never had a part in settling the doctrine, discipline, or ritual of the Church (*ibid.*, iii. 35).

the observance of holy-days, the regular and frequent celebration of the Holy Communion, the administration of Holy Baptism in the public service, the offertory, the dress of the preacher, duly attended to? Glaringly they were not. The Bishop of London (Dr. Blomfield) called attention to these points in his Charge of 1842, and desired that the rubrics might be observed. Islington, which had long been a stronghold of the Evangelicals, protested, and the Bishop gave its clergy a sort of tacit dispensation from full obedience to the rubrics. But he could hardly enforce in other parts of his diocese what he had dispensed with in one part.[1] He had distinctly intimated in his Charge that the surplice was the only garment contemplated in the Prayer-Book for the use of the preacher—at any rate, at the morning service, in which alone a sermon is recognised; and as that which catches the outward eye is sure to make the greatest impression, the wearing of the surplice in preaching gave the greatest offence. The Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Philpotts) took up the tale, and enjoined the strict observance of the rubrics in his

[1] Even nearer home than Islington the Bishop had some difficulty in enforcing his wishes, as the following passage from the interesting 'Reminiscences of William Rogers' will show: 'The Bishop had just [1842] been delivering a Charge in which he had severely admonished the clergy on the duty of complying literally with the requirements of the rubrics, etc. Mr. Baker [the Vicar of Fulham], who was a strong Evangelical . . . by no means saw things in the same light as the Bishop, and was not very inclined to carry out the episcopal wishes. The Bishop, on the other hand, could hardly afford to have his injunctions slighted under the very shadow of Fulham Palace, and met the case half-way by offering to provide an extra curate at his own cost. This the Vicar agreed to, and I was the result,' pp. 41, 42.

diocese. *Surplice Riots* occurred in both dioceses, and the clergy who, in obedience to the orders of their diocesans, preached in the surplice were mobbed, pelted, and sometimes in danger of their lives. In fact, the regulations were so unpopular that Bishop Blomfield, in his Charge of 1846, withdrew what he had recommended in 1842.

But he did not thereby put an end to the ritual disputes. One of the most advanced churches (for those days) was S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, of which the Rev. J. W. E. Bennett, a very able and energetic man, and an effective preacher, was the incumbent. Bishop Blomfield was an indefatigable worker himself, and he was always ready to recognise good work in others, though he might not altogether agree with the views of the workers. He therefore consented to consecrate a daughter church of S. Paul's, which Mr. Bennett had erected. On S. Barnabas' Day, 1850, the consecration services at S. Barnabas', Pimlico, took place with a high ceremonial, as it was then thought. All passed off well on the day, but when the services were continued on the same lines the mob began to interrupt them with hootings and groanings, and to insult the clergy. The Bishop remonstrated, but Mr. Bennett replied with some effect, that there was nothing in the services but what his lordship had sanctioned on the day of consecration. The Bishop then claimed the fulfilment of a promise which Mr. Bennett had given him, that he would resign his living if it was for the good of the Church.

Mr. Bennett resigned, but his successor, Mr. Liddell, conducted the services, both at S. Paul's and S. Barnabas, on the same lines ; and hence arose

the first of the great ritual suits. In the Consistory Court of London, Mr. Westerton, a churchwarden at S. Paul's, prayed for a faculty 'for the removal of the high altar with the cross elevated thereon, or attached thereto, the gilded candlesticks and candles, the credence-table, and the several divers coloured altar coverings.' Mr. Beal, a parishioner of S. Barnabas', Pimlico, made a similar petition for that church, and on December 5, 1855, the Judge of the Consistory Court pronounced judgment in the two cases. He decreed a faculty for 'the removal of the credence-tables and all cloths for covering the table, except one covering of silk or other decent stuff.' The cross was to be removed; a wooden table was to be substituted for the stone altar; only a fair linen cloth, without lace or embroidery, was to be used. The brazen gates were censured, but not declared illegal. Mr. Liddell appealed to the Court of Arches, and on December 20, 1856, the Dean of Arches (Sir John Dodson) affirmed Dr. Lushington's rulings, and condemned the appellant in costs. Then Mr. Liddell appealed to Her Majesty in Council. The case was heard in 1857 by the Judicial Committee, which reversed the judgment about the wooden cross in the chancel of S. Barnabas', and that about the 'cloths,' but affirmed that about the stone altar at S. Barnabas' and that about the embroidery.[1]

Meanwhile, a still more important, if less sensational, case of doctrine was being agitated. In 1853 Archdeacon Denison, then, as now,[2] ever ready to

[1] See Archdeacon Perry's 'Student's English Church History,' Third Period, iii., 317-321.

[2] Since these words were written, the brave old Archdeacon has been called to his rest.

fight for what he deemed to be the truth, preached two sermons in Wells Cathedral, strongly inculcating the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist. He published the sermons, his object evidently being, not merely to instruct the congregation he was addressing, but to have the momentous subject ventilated for the benefit of the whole Church. He was not disappointed. A neighbouring clergyman, Mr. Ditcher, Vicar of South Brent, took up the glove, as it were, and applied to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who issued a commission under the Church Discipline Act of 1840. The commission (which consisted of five clergymen of the diocese) found that there was *primâ facie* ground for further proceedings; so the suit was proceeded with in the Pro-Consistory Court at Bath, the Archbishop of Canterbury presiding. In 1856 Dr. Lushington, acting for the Archbishop of Canterbury, passed sentence, depriving the Archdeacon of his vicarage and archdeaconry. The Archdeacon appealed to the Provincial Court, which set aside the sentence on technical grounds. The case was then carried to the Final Court of Appeal, which in 1858 confirmed the sentence of the Provincial Court. Thus, so far as law was concerned, the brave Archdeacon had not gained his object, for matters were left in the same uncertainty as before; but the agitation elicited two treatises which must have gladdened Archdeacon Denison's heart, Dr. Pusey's fragment on 'The Real Presence,' and John Keble's work on 'Eucharistical Adoration.'

The next year, 1859, witnessed a very sad episode in the history of the English Church, which must be briefly noticed. In 1842 the Rev. Bryan King,

a Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford, accepted the college living of S. George's-in-the-East, London. The parish included a large waterside population, among whom a separate mission was established, which now forms the parish of S. Peter's, London Docks. In this mission noble work was done by two mission priests, the Revs. C. F. Lowder and A. H. Mackonochie. In conjunction with these two good men and other earnest workers, the Rector was gradually ameliorating the moral and spiritual state of his parishioners, and thereby, of course, injuring the profits of those who had pandered to their vicious tastes. Mr. Bryan King had already encountered much opposition in carrying out the order of his diocesan to use the Prayer for the Church Militant, and to preach in the surplice; but he had also rallied around him a party who helped him to establish a choral service in the parish church, and who afterwards presented him with the eucharistic vestments. By an Act of George II. the vestry of the parish had the privilege of nominating an 'afternoon lecturer,' or 'reader,' and in May, 1859, they nominated the Rev. Hugh Allen, a strong no-Popery man. On the unseemly conflicts between the morning and the afternoon congregations—that is, between the adherents of Mr. Bryan King and the adherents of Mr. Hugh Allen—we need not enter. Suffice it to say that the church practically fell into the hands of the mob. The riots that occurred were most disgraceful, and on September 25 the church had to be closed by the order of the Bishop. It was re-opened after a month, and the riots broke out afresh, reaching their climax on February 26, 1860. Not only High Churchmen, but men of the type of

Dean Stanley and Mr. T. Hughes, were indignant at the disgracefulness of the proceedings. Stanley, who was deeply interested in the mission work of Lowder and his colleagues, intervened as peacemaker. He persuaded the Rector to retire on a year's leave of absence (which the then Bishop of London, Dr. Tait, the friend of Stanley and Hughes, was very ready to grant), and with the full concurrence of Mr. Lowder and Mr. Mackonochie, who were of course deeply interested in the matter, procured the appointment of Mr. Septimus Hansard, an old Rugbeian and a former pupil of the Dean, as *locum tenens*. The arrangement was not in the end perfectly successful; but at any rate, it put a stop to the riots, which were nothing less than a scandal.

We next come to a very different case. In the early part of 1860 appeared a volume under the rather vague title of 'Essays and Reviews,' written by seven writers, six of whom were clergymen. The volume seems to have been intended as a sort of continuation of the series of Oxford and Cambridge Essays which had lately appeared, and to have been written on the same principle of independent authorship. In a preface which has now become historical, it was declared: 'The authors are responsible for their respective essays only. They have written with an entire independence of one another, and without concert or comparison.' Whether this was a wise plan, considering the nature of the work, which is described in the same preface as 'a free handling in a becoming spirit of subjects peculiarly liable to suffer by the repetition of conventional language,' may be doubted; but that the statement was literally

true is shown by the fact that the first essay (on 'The Education of the World') is simply the substance of a sermon preached by Dr. Temple a year before in the Oxford University pulpit on the occasion of his appointment to the head-mastership of Rugby. It is rather difficult to conceive how so wise a man could have blindly committed himself to a quasi-partnership with men, some of whom must have held very different views from his own; but *he* at least succeeded in disentangling himself from his associates, and has become one of the ablest and most effective of modern bishops.[1] The volume did not make much sensation at first, until the *Westminster Review* gave it the doubtful benefit of its warm approval, and called upon the writers to come out of the Church and boldly declare themselves Comtists. Then the *Quarterly Review* in an article, the writer of which was soon known to be the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Wilberforce), showed up the tendency of the volume in scathing terms, and the most intense excitement prevailed. Addresses and memorials were sent in from all quarters to the bishops as guardians of the Church's faith; and in February, 1861, a meeting of the bishops was held at Lambeth, and a reply was sent to one out of the very many addresses, signed by twenty-five bishops, expressing 'the pain it had given them that any clergyman should have expressed such opinions' as those which were found in the volume, which, they intimated, were 'not consistent with an honest subscription to the formularies of our Church, with many of the

[1] Since this was written, Dr. Temple has become Primate of all England, with general approval.

fundamental doctrines of which they appear to be essentially at variance.'[1]

The book was neither unanswerable nor unanswered. Few unprejudiced persons will now deny that the 'Aids to Faith' and the 'Replies to "Essays and Reviews"' were at least as able and convincing as the volume which called them forth, to say nothing of the many very able replies to individual essays. What alarmed Churchmen was, not the formidable nature of the attack on 'conventional Christianity,' as it was termed, for in truth the attack was not very formidable, but rather the fact that there were clergymen in responsible positions who held such opinions.

So far as litigation was concerned, it was confined to the two most glaring clerical offenders—the Rev. Rowland Williams, Vicar of Broad Chalk; and the Rev. H. B. Wilson, Vicar of Great Haughton, the very same man who, twenty years before, had protested, as one of the four tutors, against Mr. Newman for tampering with the Articles. Dr. Williams was prosecuted by his own diocesan, Bishop Denison of Salisbury; Mr. Wilson by a private clergyman in the diocese of Ely, the Rev. James Fendall. Both suits came before the Court of Arches under the Church Discipline Act. No less than thirty-two articles were produced against Dr. Williams, nineteen against Mr. Wilson. The judge, Dr. Lushington, rejected all but three in each case, but declared (December 15, 1862) that the three in both cases had been proved, and suspended the defendants from their benefices for one year, and condemned them in costs. Both appealed to the

[1] See 'Life of Archbishop Tait,' i. 282.

Judicial Committee, who in 1864 reversed the judgment of the Arches on the ground that 'no verbal contradiction between the impugned statements and the Articles and formularies of the Church had been established.'

The decision caused a general cry of indignation among both High and Low Churchmen, but was, of course, warmly welcomed by the Broad Church party.[1] Verbal contradiction there might not be; but no one could read the essays of Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson without feeling that the obvious tendency of the one was to shake men's belief in the accuracy of Holy Scripture, and of the other to dispense with any definite creeds in a National Church.

After some difficulty and hesitation, the Church freed itself from any complicity with the teaching of either of the acquitted writers, by pronouncing a synodical condemnation of the book in both Houses of the Convocation of both provinces.

One expects criticism from the students at a learned University, but hardly from the practical workers in the mission-field, where, of all places, Christians should have no doubt about their position, and should show a united front. Nevertheless, it was in the wilds of Africa, not in the cloisters of Oxford, that the next case of heresy arose. To understand its origin and significance, we must go back a little. In 1853 the gigantic diocese of South Africa, over which the indefatigable Bishop Gray had presided since 1847, was divided into three; John Armstrong was appointed Bishop of Grahamstown, and John William Colenso Bishop of Natal.

[1] For a view of the matter from the Broad Church side, see 'Life of Dean Stanley,' ii. 157, 158, and 187.

Both had the reputation of being sound Churchmen, and the latter was appointed on the unexceptionable recommendation of George Hills, then the very successful Vicar of Great Yarmouth, afterwards Bishop of British Columbia. The arrangement which was then made marked very strongly the position of Bishop Gray as Metropolitan. From 1847 to 1853 he had been simply Bishop of Capetown, and a suffragan of the Archbishop of Canterbury; but in November, 1853, he resigned his see, in order that it might be reconstituted as a metropolitical see, with jurisdiction over Grahamstown and Natal. On December 8 he was reappointed, the Attorney-General (Sir Richard Bethell, afterwards Lord Westbury) insisting upon letters patent from the Crown being drawn up for the three African prelates. So Bishop Colenso received letters patent declaring him Bishop of Natal, 'subject and subordinate to the Bishop of Capetown,' to whom he was to take an oath of due obedience.

For a time all went well. Bishop Colenso was an active, earnest prelate, and Bishop Gray himself bore deserved testimony to his 'noble character.' But after a while he became unsettled in his views. He was puzzled by the questions of an 'intelligent Zulu,' which he could not answer, and which shook his faith in the historical accuracy of the Old Testament. Nor does the New Testament appear to have fared much better; for in 1861 he published a 'Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,' contending that that Epistle dealt a death-blow to all notions of covenant and privilege—that is, to all notions of a Church, as the term had always been understood.

Then followed his 'Critical Examination of the

Pentateuch,' published in detachments from 1862 to 1866. His conclusions were sufficiently startling. He declared that the books contained much matter which was not historical, and that he could no longer use the Ordination Service, in which the truth of the Bible is assumed; nor the Baptismal Service, on account of its allusion to the Deluge. The legislation of Leviticus and Numbers was pronounced to be the work of a far later age than that to which it was attributed; the Book of Deuteronomy to have been probably written by the prophet Jeremiah, and so forth. That Bishop Colenso was an honest and fearless inquirer after truth seems to me unquestionable; but he certainly laid himself open to the characteristically caustic description of him by Mr. Disraeli as 'the Bishop who commenced his theological studies after he had grasped the crozier'; and it was surely not narrow-mindedness which made Churchmen feel outraged and alarmed. It was bad enough for beneficed clergymen, and men who held offices in a University which took *Dominus illuminatio mea* for its motto, to propound heresy; but it was worse still for a Bishop, and a Bishop who was supported by the voluntary contributions of Churchmen for the express purpose of commending the Book which he attacked. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel appealed to the Primate as its President, and the Bishops met, and advised the society to withhold its confidence from the Bishop of Natal until he had cleared himself; they also agreed, by a majority of twenty-five to four to inhibit him from preaching in their dioceses. He was tried at Capetown in a Church synod, and Bishop Gray, acting as Metropolitan with coercive

jurisdiction over him, on December 16, 1863, pronounced sentence of deprivation against him. Bishop Colenso refused to appear at the trial, protested against the proceedings, and appealed to the Crown; and the case was tried before the Judicial Committee.

A previous case showed plainly enough what the decision of the Judicial Committee would be. In 1856 Bishop Gray summoned his clergy to a diocesan synod. One of them, Mr. Long, refused to attend, on the ground that the Bishop had no authority to hold such a meeting. On being summoned to a second synod, in 1860, he again refused, and the Bishop suspended him from the cure of souls and withdrew his license. Mr. Long and his churchwarden brought an action against the Bishop before the Supreme Court of the colony, which decided in the Bishop's favour. Then Mr. Long appealed to the Judicial Committee, who on June 24, 1863, reversed the judgment of the colonial court. It did the same a few months later in the case of Bishop Colenso; and, curiously enough, the very same man who as Attorney-General ten years before insisted upon letters patent being drawn up for the appointment of Bishop Gray as Metropolitan, with coercive jurisdiction over his suffragans, now, as Lord Chancellor, declared that the Crown had exceeded its powers in issuing such letters, because, in 1850, a constitutional Government had been established in the Cape of Good Hope. There was, in fact, in the eye of the law, no see either of Capetown or Natal. How this fact came to be overlooked in 1853 (the Cape Government having already been established for three years) is unaccountable.

However, all this had to do with the law of the State, not of the Church. Bishop Gray appealed to his brother prelates in England to recognise him as Bishop of a free and independent Church, to pronounce his excommunication of Bishop Colenso valid, and to sanction him in appointing a new Bishop of Natal. The Church at home could not move quite so rapidly as the enthusiastic Bishop desired, but on the whole it showed sympathy with his trials. The S.P.G. and the S.P.C.K. transferred their grants for Natal to Bishop Gray, and the trustees of the Colonial Bishopric Fund declined to pay Bishop Colenso his episcopal income; but it was decided in the Rolls Court, by Lord Romilly, that Dr. Colenso was still Bishop of Natal, and entitled to the temporalities, and Bishop Colenso returned to his diocese triumphant, so far as the law of the State could make him so. Bishop Gray, however, persisted in his determination to have an orthodox bishop; and Mr. Butler, of Wantage, was elected Bishop of Pietermaritzburg in 1866, but was persuaded by the Archbishop of Canterbury to withdraw, because, in the opinion of his Grace, it would be desirable to have a less-pronounced Churchman in the distracted diocese. At last Mr. H. K. Macrorie accepted the post, and was consecrated at Capetown in 1869, on account of the technical difficulties in the way of his being consecrated either in England or Scotland. For twenty-five years Bishop Macrorie performed his arduous and delicate task most admirably, but for some years there was in Natal one Bishop in the eyes of the State, another in the eyes of the Church, a painfully anomalous state of affairs.

The quarter of a century which followed the

secession of Newman was a period during which the minds of many were unsettled on matters of faith, and besides the more important controversies which have been noticed above, there were some minor ones which require at least a passing word.

In 1860 Mr. D. B. Heath, a quondam Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, then holding the college living of Brading, in the Isle of Wight, startled the orthodox by publishing a series of 'Sermons on Important Subjects,' in which he directly traversed the received opinions on justification, on the propitiation wrought by Christ's blood, on the forgiveness of sins, and on sin generally. He was prosecuted in the Court of Arches by a Mr. Burder, at the instance of his diocesan (Bishop R. Sumner). Judgment went against him, and he was declared to have forfeited his living. He appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, who confirmed the decision of the Lower Court in 1862. Mr. Heath was deprived of his living, and passed into retirement.

In 1863-4 Mr. C. Voysey preached some sermons, first as curate, and then as Vicar of Healaugh, near Tadcaster, which drew upon him the strictures of his diocesan, the Archbishop of York. Against the advice of Dean Stanley, whom he consulted as a friend, he published what he had preached, and was prosecuted in the Chancery Court of York, which, on December 2, 1869, gave judgment against him on the charge of heresy. He then appealed to the Judicial Committee, who, on February 11, 1871, confirmed the decision of the Chancery Court. Mr. Voysey seceded from the Church, and opened a separate place of worship in London.

In 1866 a remarkable volume appeared, entitled 'Ecce Homo,' which rapidly passed through several editions, and created a great sensation for a time, which was increased by the fact that it followed closely in the wake of the publication of Renan's 'Vie de Jésus.' Of the tendency of Renan's work there could be no doubt, but men's minds were greatly exercised as to the drift and meaning of the anonymous writer (now known to have been Professor J. R. Seeley) in his 'Ecce Homo.' He strove to place himself in the position of those who knew Jesus simply as He would appear to his contemporaries, and worked out the history from the human side. The volume was avowedly only a fragment, and another volume was promised, which would presumably give the writer's views on the vital question of the real Divinity of our Blessed Lord. Many earnest Christians (Mr. Gladstone among the number) thought that the volume was a valuable contribution to Christological literature. But many thought that it was of a most dangerous tendency, and was calculated to play into the hands of those who agreed with Renan; and it was ably answered, in 1867, in a book bearing the happy title of 'Ecce Deus.' The promised sequel to 'Ecce Homo' appeared sixteen years later, under the title of 'Natural Religion,' but so far from reassuring men's minds, it led many to think that the writer's faith had receded in the interval.

It was the same unsettlement of men's minds which caused a long and heated discussion, lasting for nearly nine years, on the subject of the Athanasian Creed. Innumerable suggestions were made —*e.g.*, to leave its use in the public service optional,

by the substitution of the word 'may' for the word 'shall' in the rubric at the head of the Creed; to expunge it altogether from the Liturgy, and relegate it to a similar position to that of the Thirty-nine Articles in the Prayer-Book; to omit the 'damnatory clauses' (more properly minatory); to have a new translation of the Creed made from the original Latin; to diminish greatly the number of services at which it should be appointed to be said; to insert an explanatory note, stating the sense in which the Church understood it. The last course was recommended, in spite of a strong protest from Dean Stanley, by the Ritual Commission, who, on August 31, 1870, suggested the following note, to be appended to the rubric: 'Note, that the condemnations in this confession of faith are to be no otherwise understood than as a solemn warning of the peril of those who wilfully reject the Catholic faith.' But this pleased neither side. It left untouched the grievance of those who objected to the use of the Creed in public service, and it did not at all satisfy those who, among other things, thought it presumptuous in a local Church to meddle in any way with a Creed of Christendom. The question was discussed in Convocation session after session, where Dean Stanley was a vehement advocate for the disuse of the Creed. A committee was appointed by the Southern Convocation, and at last a *Synodical Declaration*, most carefully worded, was accepted by both Houses of Canterbury and by the Lower House of York, but not by the Upper. The matter was quietly allowed to drop.

Meanwhile the ritual question was further off than ever from a satisfactory settlement. A committee

of the Lower House of the Southern Convocation sent in its first report, dated June 5, 1866, on the six points at issue, viz., Vestments, Altar Lights, Incense, Elevation of the Elements, non-communicating attendance, and the use of Wafer Bread; and the result of long and anxious discussions in both Houses was that the Lower House resolved that, 'having regard to the ritual observances treated of in the report presented to the House on June 26, they do concur in the judgment of the Upper House, that no alteration from the long-sanctioned and usual ritual ought to be made in our churches until the sanction of the Bishop of the diocese has been obtained thereto.' But Parliament had to be consulted as well as Convocation; Lord Shaftesbury introduced a Bill in the House of Lords called the Clerical Vestments Bill, which was thrown out, and a Royal Commission was issued (1867) to consider the whole subject.

In the same year, 1867, commenced the first action in the famous suit of *Martin* v. *Mackonochie*. No two names were more prominent in the early ritual disputes than those of Charles Fuge Lowder and Alexander Heriot Mackonochie. The two men had stood shoulder to shoulder through the disgraceful riots which occurred at S. George's-in-the-East in 1859; and in the sixties, Mr. Lowder at S. Peter's, London Docks, and Mr. Mackonochie at S. Alban's, Holborn, were doing noble work among the poor upon what they regarded as the true Church lines. People who detested their practices respected their characters; and it is noticeable that the relations between Mr. Mackonochie and his diocesan (Bishop Tait), though the two men dif-

fered widely, were personally of the most friendly character.

Mr. John Martin, the promoter of the suit against Mr. Mackonochie, was a solicitor, who resided in another part of London, but was treasurer and manager of the schools in Baldwin's Gardens, in Mr. Mackonochie's parish, and thus claimed to be a parishioner. The case was sent by letters of request to the Court of Arches, of which Sir Robert Phillimore was the new Dean. Another case, that of *Flamank* v. *Simpson,* was also brought before the Court in February, 1868; and as the cases were similar, Sir R. Phillimore gave a judgment on March 28 which applied to both. That judgment was, on the whole, favourable to Mr. Mackonochie, though not on all points, and Mr. Mackonochie promised his Bishop to obey it. But the promoters appealed to the Judicial Committee, whose decision was on every point against Mr. Mackonochie. A memorial was presented to the Ritual Commission, which was then sitting, against the judgment, on the ground that the Judicial Committee was a secular court, and that the spiritualty was never consulted. On the same ground Mr. Mackonochie declined to obey the judgment, and a series of prosecutions went on at intervals until the close of 1882, when Dr. Tait, by that time Archbishop of Canterbury, made a touching request on his death-bed to Mr. Mackonochie to resign his living for the peace of the Church; which he did.

In a brief sketch like the present, it would be impossible to enumerate all the trials for ritual or doctrine which occurred; but the famous *Purchas Judgment* of 1871 must not be omitted. The Rev.

John Purchas, Incumbent of S. James's Chapel, Brighton, was sued before the Arches Court, the promoter of the suit being Colonel Elphinstone; and on February 3, 1870, the Dean of Arches, Sir Robert Phillimore, pronounced judgment on the case. He condemned certain points of what may be called fancy ritual as illegal, but on those points to which High Churchmen attached the chief importance, that is, the ancient Eucharistic Vestments, the eastward position, the use of wafer bread and of the mixed chalice, he decided that Mr. Purchas had not acted illegally. On this occasion the now famous *Ornaments Rubric*, which had stood unheeded in the very first page of the Prayer-Book for several generations, was brought prominently forward; Sir Robert declared that 'the ornaments of the minister mentioned in the First Book of Edward VI. were those to which the rubric referred, and that he could not therefore pass any ecclesiastical sentence against Mr. Purchas for wearing them.' Then followed the usual appeal to the Judicial Committee, but as Colonel Elphinstone had died during the progress of the suit, permission was obtained to substitute Mr. Henry Hibbert's name as promoter. The Judicial Committee reversed the decision of Sir Robert Phillimore on all the points which he had decided in Mr. Purchas' favour. They declared the vestments, the eastward position, the wafer bread and the mixed chalice to be all illegal, and condemned Mr. Purchas in the costs both of the suit and the appeal. They could hardly fail to notice Sir Robert's powerful argument drawn from the Ornaments Rubric; but they declared that 'the Ornaments Rubric, as explained by the injunctions of Queen

Elizabeth, A.D. 1559, and the Advertisements of Elizabeth, A.D. 1564, made pursuant to the Act of Uniformity, 1 Eliz., c. ii., and explained by subsequent visitation articles, when construed with the canons of 1603-4, and the Act of Uniformity, 13 and 14 Car. II., c. iv., does not permit the use by the minister, while officiating at the Holy Communion, of the chasuble, the alb, or the tunick, but allows of the cope being worn in ministering the Holy Communion on high feast days, etc.'

The judgment was received with dismay, not only by those called Ritualists, but by High Churchmen generally. It emphatically condemned everything that had been contended for, and restricted the liberty of the Church of England to the narrowest limits. The interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric, especially, amazed people, for it distinctly implied that when the rubric said that certain ornaments were to be in use, it really meant that they were *not* to be in use. They could not understand how a perfectly plain rubric, inserted in 1662, could possibly be affected by any order, which was dated either one hundred or fifty years earlier.

The Purchas Judgment marked a crisis in the ritual controversy; the opposition, not to say rebellion, which it provoked, led men to see that these ritual questions could not be so easily settled as had been imagined. No one, perhaps, represented the feelings of a very large proportion of the clergy better than Bishop Wilberforce, who was now raised to the see of Winchester; and therefore his feelings as expressed in a letter to Archbishop Tait, March 9, 1871—that is, very shortly after the judgment—may be quoted: 'We are in sad trouble as to this last

decision of the Privy Council, and I greatly fear the result. The mere suppression of vestments would have passed quietly enough, but the imperative injunction to consecrate at the north end cuts far deeper, and will not be obeyed. Men feel the one-sidedness of the judgment; the playing with words, in deciding that "standing before the table" is not to mean standing before it when Purchas is condemned, and is to mean it when Mackonochie is. They feel the separation from antiquity, the breaking through a custom which has prevailed always in some churches; the narrowing of liberty; the unfairness of attempting to prevent this whilst copes are not enforced or surplices. It is a very distracting time, and, unless God hears our prayers, will end in a great schism.'[1]

It seems astonishing that so wary and sensible a man as Archbishop Tait did not see the gravity of the situation; but, as his biographer says, 'his natural sympathies and Scotch training were unecclesiastical';[2] he could not understand men attaching such importance to what he would regard as unessential trifles. The brunt of the ritual difficulties had fallen upon *him*, when he was Bishop of London; for the vast majority of the early ritual disputes had been in connection with London churches. He seems to have thought that 'a short and easy method' might be devised for dealing with ritual; and hence arose the *Act for the Better Administration of the Laws respecting the Regulation of Public Worship*, commonly called the *Public Worship Regulation Act* of 1874. This Act was not intended to make any

[1] 'Life of Archbishop Tait,' vol. ii., ch. xxi., 94, 95.

[2] *Ibid.*, vol. i., p. 52.

change in the law, but 'to give increased facilities for proceeding against clergy who introduced illegal ritual.' The Bill was first intended to be introduced into the House of Lords by the Earl of Shaftesbury; but it was thought that he was too closely identified with one party for the purpose.[1] So at a meeting of the bishops of both provinces at Lambeth in January, 1874, it was decided that the two archbishops should draft a Bill, making its provisions to accord as far as possible with the request of Convocation four years before in favour of legislation 'for facilitating, expediting, and cheapening proceedings in enforcing clergy discipline.' Through the very proper persistence of Archbishop Tait, the Bishop's veto upon any intended prosecution was a main feature of the Bill. All this looked like paying a due respect to the feelings of Churchmen; the matter was taken out of the hands of a vehement partisan like Lord Shaftesbury, and submitted to the collective wisdom of the Fathers of the Church, who, on their parts, professed their anxiety to carry out the wishes of the Church's own constitutional assembly. How was it that, instead of being hailed with gratitude, the measure excited the utmost alarm among Churchmen, many of whom by no means identified themselves with the ritualists?

1. Let it be remembered at how critical a time the Bill was passed—just after the Purchas Judgment had shown what the 'law' *was* which was to be so strenuously and summarily enforced—a law which

[1] Lord Shaftesbury had been in the habit of bringing in Bills year after year for the reform of ecclesiastical courts, just as he had brought in Bills to reform the factory system and the chimney-sweepers.

would narrow the liberty of the Church to what many regarded as an unbearable extent.

2. As a matter of fact, Convocation never was consulted. On the contrary, the Act was passed in defiance of a protest from the Lower House.[1] The bishops might be sincere in their desire to carry out the recommendations of Convocation given four years before. But many things had happened during four years which might naturally have modified those recommendations, and, moreover, it is more than doubtful whether Convocation would ever have agreed with the proposed method of carrying out the recommendations; for

3. It seemed to put a dangerous power into the hands of individual bishops, some of whom were known to be bitterly hostile to everything savouring of High Churchmanship;[2] and

4. It put a still more dangerous power into the hands of 'three aggrieved parishioners,' who were indeed required to be members of the Church of England; but, as everybody knew, men were apt to call themselves 'members of the Church of England' who were entirely out of sympathy with the Church's doctrine and discipline.

5. The judge, who was to have the tremendous power, though *nominated* by the archbishops, was in point of fact to be *appointed* simply by Act of Parlia-

[1] See Bishop Christopher Wordsworth's 'Miscellanies,' vol. i., pp. 124, 125.

[2] The Bill was described in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury as 'mulcting an incumbent of the proceeds of his living till he has yielded to the personal fancy of his Bishop,' and as 'introducing seven-and-twenty Star Chambers into the Church of England.' See also Wordsworth's 'Miscellanies,' i. 127, 131, 134.

ment, and therefore was to all intents and purposes a secular judge. Nor were men's fears allayed when it was found that the first judge appointed had been judge in the Divorce Court, a court which Churchmen regarded with no favour.

6. When the measure was passing through the House of Commons, the Prime Minister, Mr. Disraeli, described it, with unwonted indiscretion, as 'a Bill to put down ritualism'; and as Churchmen naturally understood by 'ritualism' all the points condemned by the Purchas Judgment, no wonder that they were alarmed.

As a matter of fact, the Public Worship Regulation Act did not work. It was regarded as a purely Erastian measure by a party which was far stronger than was then supposed. Several clergymen went to prison rather than submit to what seemed to them a secular authority usurping the functions of a spiritual; the Royal Commission of Ecclesiastical Courts recommended its repeal; and it has now become practically a dead letter.

The earliest and perhaps most important case that was tried under the new Act must be noticed, and then this ungrateful subject of ecclesiastical litigation may be dismissed.

Archbishop Tait, who may be regarded as the father of the Bill, found a case ready at hand on which to make an experiment of the new measure. In 1872 a complaint had been made to him about the proceedings at S. Peter's Church, Folkestone, of which the Rev. C. J. Ridsdale was incumbent. An attempt to settle the matter in the diocesan court failed; but when the Public Worship Regulation Act came into operation, the complaint was renewed with several

fresh accusations, and the Act was put in force. In January, 1876, the case was argued before Lord Penzance, sitting for the first time as Dean of Arches, who decided against Mr. Ridsdale on all the twelve points complained of. On four of these points (the eastward position, the vestments, the wafer bread, and the crucifix upon the rood-screen) Mr. Ridsdale appealed to the Judicial Committee, who on May 12, 1877, pronounced that the eastward position was legal, provided that the manual acts were visible, but condemned the other three points. Again the Ornaments Rubric was the pivot on which everything seemed to turn, and while that rubric remains untouched, it requires, to say the least, extraordinary ingenuity to explain it away. But one of the chief points of interest in the Ridsdale case is its amicable settlement, which reflects equal credit upon Mr. Ridsdale and the Archbishop. A most interesting correspondence took place between them, in which Mr. Ridsdale made his position perfectly clear and logical, as standing upon the Ornaments Rubric; but agreed that if the Archbishop, to whom he owed canonical obedience as his diocesan, would grant him a dispensation from obeying what he regarded as the plain law of the Church, he would submit, not to the judgment of the secular court, but to the judgment of his ecclesiastical superior; and the Archbishop consented.

Here we must stop, not because ecclesiastical litigation ceased after the Ridsdale case, for it became more frequent and exciting than ever, but on the principle stated in the beginning of this chapter, that a contemporary is hardly fitted to be the historian of events which have occurred within his own experience.

But before we pass on to the practical work of the Church, a word must be added about a remarkable group of men whose influence, though not easy to define, appears to me to have been far more deep, extensive and lasting than is commonly supposed. They can scarcely be called a party in the Church, but their writings and their personal exertions and characters affected all parties, and a vast number of people who belonged to no party. The notice of them comes in appropriately in this place, because they were equally connected with both the departments into which this chapter is divided. They certainly are a very important feature in the controversial aspect of the Church of the period, and they *as* certainly wrought a great practical work, and that in quarters which others had as yet hardly touched.

The central figure of the group was *Frederick Denison Maurice* (1805-1872), to whom many earnest souls, or souls whom he made earnest, looked up with affectionate reverence as their spiritual guide, alike in thought and in action.[1] On the other hand, Mr. Maurice roused a violent antagonism, both against his teaching and against his doings, which made him as important an element in the controversial as in the practical activity of his day. His early training must always be taken into account if we would judge him aright. Let it be given in his own words. 'My father,' he writes, 'was a Unitarian minister. He wished me to be one also. He had a strong feeling against the English Church, and against

[1] Since the above was written another instance of the affectionate reverence which F. D. Maurice inspired in able and earnest men has appeared in the very interesting 'Life and Letters of Fenton J. A. Hort' (1896).

Cambridge as well as Oxford. My elder sisters, and ultimately my mother, abandoned Unitarianism. But they continued to be Dissenters: they were not less, but some of them at least more, averse to the English Church than he was. I was much confused between the opposite opinions in our household.'[1]

His son and biographer thus sums up the strangely-varied influences which had been brought to bear upon him at different periods of his life, up to the time when he emerged as a real leader of men: 'He had, in his early days at Frenchay and afterwards at Southampton, been brought up among Quakers and Unitarians; he had, through their influence on his own family and himself, known the most remarkable of the Baptist and Independent preachers of the early part of the century—Hall, Foster, Vernon, etc.; he had come directly in contact with those who had assisted at the birth of the Irvingite Church. Among English parties he had been early associated, through his cousins, the Hardcastles, and his sisters, with the strictest sect of the Evangelicals and the Clapham Sect; at Cambridge he had, as he expresses it, "shouted with the Liberals"; he had been associated in "Subscription no Bondage" with the leaders of the Oxford Movement.'[2] It should be added that the last association was very slight and temporary. Maurice never saw the best side of the Oxford Movement; indeed, we may go further, and say that, like Newman, he was never, in his early life, placed in a position to do justice to the English Church generally; he himself refers quite plaintively to his 'want of that early educational sympathy with the services and constitution of the Church' on

[1] 'Life,' i. 175. [2] *Ibid.*, i. 337.

which, he thinks, other people's love for it is in some measure based.[1] Considering his antecedents, it is wonderful that he became so good a Churchman as he did. It is true that the 'cask still retained the odour with which it had been once imbued,' more or less to the end. But Maurice always contended, and, I believe, with justice, that all he taught was covered by the formularies of the Church. His crusade was against the popular glosses upon the Catholic Faith, not against any part of the Catholic Faith itself. He was deeply tinged with mysticism—'a muddy mystic' he tells us he was generally thought—but his mysticism did not shake his faith in any single article of the Creeds of Christendom, and he was a staunch advocate for the retention of all the three Creeds in the public service. The salient points of his teaching were that the object of theology was to impart the knowledge of *God*, rather than to teach a *religion;* that this knowledge enables us to realize as primary and fundamental truths (1) the Fatherhood of God, and all that that term implies; (2) the Divinity of Christ. Hence the Incarnation, not the Atonement, was the starting-point of Christianity, and the pivot upon which everything turned. He did not deny the doctrine of the Atonement (as he was accused of doing); but he *did* take exception to the popular forensic idea of that doctrine, which in his early days was almost universally prevalent. He protested against the notion that religion—let us rather say theology—is mainly concerned with the world to come. God was the rightful Governor of *this* world; and 'the knowledge of God was the key to all other knowledge, and that which connected knowledge

[1] See 'Life,' i. 169.

with life'; and he accepted the Bible as 'the interpretation of the history of mankind.' Like other mystics, he laid great stress upon the fact that Christ 'was the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world' (S. John i. 9), pursuing it to all its logical consequences. Hence, 'the central principle,' writes his biographer, 'on which his faith was based was that Christ was the Head of every man, not only of those who believed in Him.'[1] Hence, the Redemption, not the Fall, was the first thing to be insisted upon. *All* men were the children of God if they did but know it; and Baptism declared us to be, and sealed us as being, rather than made us, His children. It was not 'crown Him, and make Him a King,' but 'He is a King, therefore crown Him.' But Maurice laid the greatest stress upon the necessity and the efficacy of the two Sacraments of the Gospel. He was himself baptized at the ripe age of twenty-six; and he regarded the Holy Communion as the means of mystical union with our Risen and Ascended Lord. He clung tenaciously to the Prayer-Book as it was, objecting to all the schemes which were being agitated by Lord Ebury and others for liturgical reform. 'Do not,' he writes, 'let us surrender the one great witness which we possess that a nation consists of redeemed men, sons of God; that mankind stands not in Adam, but in Christ. Give up the Prayer-Book to an Evangelical or semi-Evangelical commission, and this witness will be eliminated from it by a thousand little alterations, which will be counted insignificant, but which will, in fact, render the English Church another Church altogether. . . . The Liturgy has

[1] 'Life,' ii. 304.

been to me a great theological teacher ; a perpetual testimony that the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, the one God blessed for ever, is the Author of all life, freedom, unity to men ; that our prayers are nothing but responses to His voice speaking to us and in us.'[1]

It will thus be seen that Maurice was not, consciously at least, out of harmony with the teaching of the Church in any one point ; but he *was* out of harmony with the popular interpretation of that teaching on many points, and the discord came to a climax on the publication of his 'Theological Essays,' in 1853. He was charged with having denied the eternity of future punishment ; but this was not the gist of his meaning. What he really did teach on the subject could not be better or more tersely expressed than in a letter addressed to the *Clerical Journal*, which Maurice himself stamped with his unqualified approval. 'What,' says the anonymous writer, 'Mr. Maurice denies is that we are plainly told, or that the English Church requires us to hold, that a wicked man must remain everlastingly a wicked man, or that death must be regarded as placing an impassable barrier against a sinner's return from sin to righteousness, or that the victory of Eternal Love over sin is impossible unless it be gained during this mortal life. The real question at issue is, not whether the *punishment of the wicked* is everlasting, but whether we have Scripture warrant for saying that the *wickedness* of any man is everlasting ; whether Holy Scripture anywhere lays down limits of space and time for the operation of God's grace and redemption.' The subject, indeed, really formed part of a wider one, viz., that of the meaning

[1] 'Life,' ii. 358, 359.

of the words 'eternal life' and 'eternal death' generally, on which Maurice held strong views, which were not in the least original, but which sounded strange to English ears in those days, though they would hardly do so now. 'Everything in our ministry,' he writes to a newly-ordained clergyman, 'as well as in our interpretation of the New Testament, depends on the force we give to the words "eternal life." Are they a mere synonym for never-ending happiness—a prize to be bestowed hereafter for a certain proper behaviour here, or right faith here? Or are the gift of life and the promise of eternal life the gift and promise of a new, higher, nobler life than that which we have been leading, the Divine life, the life of the eternal God?' Maurice strongly advocated the latter view. 'The goodness, justice, love, truth, which cannot be measured by days, months, years, centuries, I think, are the eternal things; to have them is to have eternal life; to be without them is to be in death. God's grace does raise us out of this death here; I cannot confine it by any bounds of space or time.'

Mr. Maurice lost his professorship at King's College, but found, to his surprise, that he had many sympathizers, and those among men whose sympathy was best worth having. It was the same in 1860, when an ineffectual protest was made against his appointment to the incumbency of S. Peter's, Vere Street; and lapse of time has certainly increased the number of those who, if they do not actually agree with him, at any rate perceive that he was no heretic. His worst enemies were the religious newspapers, and he regarded it as part of his mission to deliver

his countrymen from the tyranny of this self-constituted Inquisition. But the religious newspapers, like all newspapers, reflected, quite as much as they directed, popular opinion; and the real work of Mr. Maurice as a teacher seems to me to have been to show that the Catholic faith was one thing, the popular glosses upon that faith quite another. In justice to those who opposed him, it should be added that he acquired the reputation of being obscure, and that many were content to take the account of his opinions at second-hand. The reputation was not altogether undeserved. It is not easy—at any rate, for a neophyte—to see at once the point at which he is aiming. This nebulousness arose partly, perhaps, from 'the confusion of mind' which he speaks of as engendered by his early training, partly from his own extreme, almost morbid, modesty and self-diffidence, but partly also from the fact that what he desired to do was to make people think for themselves. Hence, he never said directly, 'Believe this, do that'; but, 'Look at the matter from all sides, and when you are persuaded in your own mind, then act accordingly.' To those who came under the spell he never seemed obscure. The charm of his attractive personality was irresistible. There were many who would echo Kingsley's description of him as 'the most beautiful human soul whom God has ever in His great mercy allowed me, most unworthy, to meet with upon this earth; the man who of all men whom I have seen approached nearest to my conception of S. John, the Apostle of Love.' This personality contributed greatly to the practical influence which he exercised, especially over the more thoughtful among the working classes. There had been

many good clergymen who had sincerely at heart the welfare of these classes, but few who impressed them as he did with the conviction that he was ready to look at matters from *their* point of view, and had, in the literal sense of the term, a 'sympathy' or fellow-feeling with them. Here his early experience stood him in good stead. He once described himself as 'a Churchman who can say from his heart of Unitarianism, *ἔγνων, ἀνέγνων, κατέγνων*'; and he might have said the same of many other 'isms.' How, in spite of obloquy, he grappled with the stirring events of 1848-9, and strove to Christianize Chartism, Socialism, even Communism; how he threw himself heart and soul into the co-operative movement, then in its infancy; how he was a pioneer in the matter of the higher female education; how he touched the more educated laymen as they had never been touched before, 'awakening in them,' as the congregation of Lincoln's Inn Chapel said, 'a new sense of the living truth of the Scriptures and the Prayer-Book, especially in their application to the events and details of our social and common life,'[1] cannot here be told. Many will think that the notice of this remarkable man has already been inordinately long; but the writer's apology is that he agrees with what Maurice's friend Julius Hare said of his influence as early as 1853, before that influence had reached its height: 'I do not believe that there is any other living man who has done anything at all approaching to what Maurice has effected in reconciling the reason and conscience of the thoughtful men of our age to the faith of the Church.' If this be even approximately

[1] See 'Life,' ii. 224.

true, he may fairly claim an important place in any history of the Church.

Mr. Maurice's teaching was interpreted in 'a tongue understanded of the people' by his devoted disciple, *Charles Kingsley* (1819-1871), whose personality was more striking than that of Maurice himself. The characters of the two men differed widely: Maurice was brought up outside the Church; Kingsley in its very heart, all his home life being spent in town or country parsonages. Maurice was essentially a student; Kingsley a man of action, and devoted to all manly exercises, in which Maurice never excelled. As a writer Maurice was somewhat difficult to follow; Kingsley so clear and incisive that he carried the reader along with him without an effort. Maurice confined himself to prose; Kingsley always thought that his proper vocation was poetry, and though his prose now ranks higher than his verse, he was certainly not without the divine afflatus. Maurice never attempted fiction after his first youthful essay in it; Kingsley was pre-eminently the successful novelist. Maurice wrote little except on theology and philosophy; Kingsley on all sorts of subjects, human and divine. Both were attracted by the mystic writers; but mysticism touched Kingsley at a different point from that at which it touched Maurice. He was a devoted lover and student of Nature in all its forms; and hence it was the mysticism which gave a deep, hidden, spiritual meaning to all Nature that fascinated him most; whereas the mysticism which attracted Maurice was only that which affected man. And yet, in spite of the far wider range of subjects in which Kingsley was interested, the relationship between the two men

was always that of master and pupil. Kingsley always spoke of Maurice as 'my master'; and Maurice, so far as an intensely modest man could do, always recognised their relative positions. But in one direction Kingsley did good work for the Church which 'his master' had neither the opportunity, nor perhaps the gift, of doing. He was, as he quaintly expressed it, 'Esau's parson, not Jacob's.' His keen interest in country sport, and in country pursuits generally, enabled him to sympathize with country gentlemen and sportsmen of all grades, and with agriculturists, farmers, and labourers alike; and his soldierly instincts, which he never lost, drew to him the soldier class, both officers and men, whom the neighbourhood of Eversley to Aldershot gave him rare opportunities of influencing. Hence, men were affected by him as they had not been affected by clergymen before; and he was regarded as the apostle of 'muscular Christianity,' a term which he thought most offensive, but which was understood, at any rate, by many, in a complimentary, not an offensive sense.

Kingsley and Maurice, with their followers, were Churchmen, but were not in sympathy with any Church party; they were suspicious of, and suspected by, the rising Oxford School, and they were violently attacked by the Evangelicals as represented in their organ, the *Record*. Nor can they at all be identified with the Liberal or Broad Church party; indeed, Mr. Maurice's biographer assures us that Broad Church was 'the title the most offensive to him of all, because most nearly designating the new party he dreaded,' adding that 'some called him by that name, though it represented the denial of all for

which he had striven in life.'[1] He is amply borne out in this strong language by Mr. Maurice himself, who writes to Mr. Isaac Taylor in 1859: 'I do not know well what the *Broad Church* is. I always took it to be a fiction of Conybeare's. If it means anything, I suppose it is a representation, made under different modifications, of that creed which is contained in Whately's books, or of that which has arisen at Oxford out of the reaction against Tractarianism. Now, I must say that I would rather trust a living book'—he is writing about the proposed revision of the Prayer-Book—'to the Lowest Churchman, who had imbibed his love from Newton or Romaine, than to these accomplished and tolerant persons.' As to Mr. Kingsley, he distinctly calls himself 'an old-fashioned High Churchman,' and as he grew older he certainly drew nearer and nearer to that description of his position.

At the same time, it is certainly true that the chief admirers of Maurice and Kingsley were, more or less, Broad Church; and that both Maurice and Kingsley united in common action with the Broad Churchman proper in opposing prosecutions on all sides, whether against Tractarians, Ritualists, Evangelicals or Heterodox. And if they were not, technically speaking, Liberals themselves, they tended greatly to liberalize both High Churchmen and Low Churchmen alike. Let anyone compare a typical High Churchman or a typical Low Churchman of the present day with a type of either class of fifty years ago, and he cannot fail to observe the enormous difference which half a century has made in widening

[1] 'Life,' ii. 595.

the horizon of both; and the change seems to me to be largely due to the influence, direct or indirect, of the remarkable men we have been considering. Many others, however, who were by no means identified with the positive teaching of Mr. Maurice, contributed to the same result. Among them were his own brother-in-law, friend and quondam tutor, Archdeacon Julius Hare; Bishop Connop Thirlwall, perhaps the shrewdest and clearest intellect of his day; Mr. F. W. Robertson, the most striking of preachers, and a clergyman who, within his range, acquired the confidence of intelligent laymen, especially of the working classes, to as great an extent as Maurice and Kingsley; and all that able and high-minded group of men who were formed on the Rugby type, and who derived their inspiration, directly or indirectly, from Dr. Arnold. Of these Dean Stanley was the most distinguished, though perhaps also the most extreme instance. But such men never formed one united party, and therefore could only be treated as individuals. This would lead us too far afield; so, with this brief notice of them, we may pass on at once to the practical work of the Church, which, after all, is her greatest glory since the Oxford Movement.

And first must be noticed a number of legislative acts which certainly cleared the way for that work, though some of them were regarded with not unnatural suspicion, and met with much adverse criticism. In 1836 was incorporated, by Act of Parliament, a permanent body of *Ecclesiastical Commissioners*, whose duty was, broadly speaking, to deal with the revenues of the Church. The very unequal distribution of these revenues rendered some such

measure necessary; but one can well understand that exception should be taken against it on more grounds than one. The composition of the body was so unsatisfactory that it had to be remodelled four years later. The wholesale redistribution of ecclesiastical revenues was a violation of one of the first principles of Church property, viz., that it does not belong to one great corporation, but to the separate corporations to which it is attached. But in spite of manifold objections, both in principle and detail, it can hardly be denied that, as Mr. Hore truly remarks, 'to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners the present vitality of the Church is in a great measure attributable.'[1] In 1836 was passed the *Tithes Commutation Act*, which commuted payment of tithes in kind—a most clumsy arrangement, equally inconvenient to the payer and the receiver, and productive of endless heartburnings and disputes between them—into a rent-charge upon the land, and which put tithes on the same level as other property. One more Act of 1836 was the *Episcopal Act*, which provided, though very timidly and tentatively, for the erection of new sees, and remedied to some extent the glaring inequality in the values of different existing sees. In 1838 came the *Pluralities Act*, which had for its laudable object the settlement of a resident clergyman, as far as possible, in every parish. And, finally, in 1840 was passed the *Cathedral Act*, which dealt with the cathedral revenues and staff in a most drastic manner, and on the very mistaken idea that a great part of the cathedral was not only useless, but could not be made useful; but

[1] 'The Church in England from William III. to Victoria,' ii. 372.

which at the same time helped to remove what was, as we shall see presently, one of the crying evils of the Church. The effects of these various measures will appear in detail when we pass, as we may now do, to the practical work of the Church during the last half-century.

The same spiritual earnestness and mental activity which have made men so keen in contending for what they believed to be the truth have also rendered the period before us peculiarly fruitful in practical work. Evidences of this strike the outward eye in the enormous number of Churches which have been built or restored, the schools, the mission-rooms, the recreation-rooms, the Church institutes, and so forth, which have been erected. Notice has been taken in the last chapter of the great impetus which was given to church-building after the French War, both by the Parliamentary grants and by the voluntary efforts of the Church Building Society and of private individuals. But, in spite of all this, the general condition, especially of our country churches, was simply disgraceful. Many of them were all but in ruins; still more in a state of squalid neglect. And when money *had* been spent, it had too often done more harm than good, either by filling the church with pews which practically excluded the poor from their rightful heritage, or by blocking up beautiful arches with hideous galleries, or by mutilating ancient relics to suit the supposed exigencies of modern times. If the restored, well-ordered church is now the rule rather than the exception, if neatness has taken the place of squalor, good taste of bad taste, suggestive symbolism of preposterous inappropriateness, the change will, in nine cases out

of ten, be found to have taken place within the last fifty years.

And the outward appearance of the fabric is an index of the change that has taken place in the services which have been conducted within. It is strange that though the Prayer-Book, with its definite and well-digested system of worship, was before their eyes, even good men seem to have entered so little into its spirit. You heard good sermons and (now and then) good singing. Countless numbers worshipped God in spirit and in truth, and found the most suitable expression of their wants and aspirations, their gratitude and their joy, in the glorious language of the Liturgy, with which they were so familiar. But the definite system of the Church, as it is clearly marked out in the Prayer-Book, was little understood—as, indeed, it scarcely could be, seeing that in comparatively few churches was it presented in anything like its fulness. The Church's year from Advent to Advent, with its regular recurrence of fasts and festivals, was not followed out with any sort of regularity; but such a change has come about within the last fifty years that it is now the exception rather than the rule, where it is not followed out, at any rate to some extent. The psalmody has at least ceased to be a torture to the cultivated ear, and Tate and Brady have been superseded by hymns, some of which are worthy of their place in the midst of the most splendid liturgy in the world. The custom of beginning the Lord's Day with the celebration of the Holy Eucharist has not only restored the highest service of the Church to its proper position, but has also relieved the tedium, which the conglomeration of

two or three services, never intended to be so conglomerated, naturally engendered; while the introduction of regular children's services in the afternoon, a thing unknown fifty or sixty years ago, has helped to make children love public worship instead of dreading it, as they must have done, when they had to restrain their natural restlessness (on pain of feeling the beadle's cane) during a lengthy function, the full meaning of which they could not possibly understand.

Nowhere, perhaps, has the improvement in the mode of public worship been more marked than in our cathedral churches. Partly on the principle that it is easier to turn a little boat than a large ship, partly from the proverbial *vis inertiæ* of corporations, civil or ecclesiastical, the mother churches of our dioceses did not lead the van, but followed in the wake of improvement. No part of the Church's system had been more violently attacked—and, it must be owned, not without reason—than the cathedral system. Even those who were proud of our cathedrals as noble specimens of Gothic architecture did not seem quite to know what to do with them. The idea of making the cathedral the great centre of worship, which should be a model and an encouragement to lesser places, had died out. Its revival, strange to say, seems to have been due, in the first instance, to the exigencies of the great Exhibition of 1851. What was to be done to provide for the religious wants of the vast influx of strangers into London in that year? It occurred to those who asked this question that there were two great buildings which might be temporarily utilized for the purpose. The naves of S. Paul's and Westminster

Abbey had not been used for public worship for many generations, except on rare and special occasions; they were now put to this use, and were crowded with worshippers. But this was only an extraordinary effort for an extraordinary occasion. With the close of the exhibition the nave services closed too; and it was not until 1858, after the crowded services on Sunday evenings at Exeter Hall had shown that there was a real demand, that first the nave of Westminster Abbey, and then that of S. Paul's, was thrown open for a popular evening service during part of the year. The then Bishop of London, Dr. Tait, whose heart was thoroughly in sympathy with evangelistic work, was mainly instrumental in bringing this about. After a while the plan was extended throughout the whole year; the cathedrals in the provinces one by one followed the example of the Metropolis, and no one can now complain that the most splendid ecclesiastical edifices in the kingdom are ornaments and nothing more.

The outcry had not been against the edifices—no one since the days of Cromwell had desired *their* destruction—but against the staff by which they were manned. What, it was asked, was the use of deans and chapters, canons and prebendaries? While the bees of the hive were working and starving, those drones were doing next to nothing, and revelling in a plethora of wealth. So the besom of Reform, having swept away Old Sarum and Gatton, proceeded to do its work on these useless appendages of the Church, as they were thought. The *Cathedral Act* of 1840 swept into the coffers of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners three or four hundred prebendal estates, and limited the number and reduced

the revenues of residentiary canons. In 1851 a Royal Commission, appointed to inquire into the state of cathedral and collegiate churches, seriously discussed the possibility of turning deans into bishops or of abolishing the office altogether, and transferring its revenues into an episcopal or parochial fund.[1] But it was at last discovered that cathedral chapters might really be turned to some use, and that without making any new law, but simply by requiring them to obey their own old statutes, which had become a dead letter. Canon Jebb of Hereford published a telling 'Plea for Cathedrals,' which had some effect; and the Lower House of Convocation represented 'that cathedral churches and their chapters are a principal portion of the framework of the Church; that they are designed to be the chief churches of the diocese, to supply a council to the bishops,[2] and to exercise a pervading influence through the diocese.' These ideas were worked out not only on paper, but in action by Bishop Christopher Wordsworth at Lincoln, by Bishop Benson (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury) at Truro, and others; and in time the cathedral system was utilized as it was intended to be, and made a most valuable, indeed an indispensable, part of the general system of the Church. Bishop Wordsworth's two watchwords for the residentiary canons were 'residence' and 'work,' the former being absolutely necessary if the latter is to be done; for what can a 'residentiary,' who only 'resides' three months in the year, do to any purpose? And now, among the various complaints against the Church, it would be simply preposterous

[1] Perry, iii. [2] The Capitular Body is 'Senatus Episcopi.'

to raise that which was once the loudest of all—the uselessness of the cathedral system.

The activity of deans and chapters has certainly been at least equalled by that of bishops. Anyone who is at all inclined to lead an idle—or, let us say, a contemplative—life, must cry from his very soul *Nolo episcopari;* for the days are past when a bishopric can be regarded as a post of dignified ease and learned leisure. When all (*exceptis excipiendis*) have worked so hard, it is invidious to select names, but one can hardly be wrong in mentioning the name of *Samuel Wilberforce* as having set an example of episcopal energy, tact and versatility which others have not been slow to follow. For the last fifty years the bishop has been in most cases the pivot on which the whole work of the diocese turned. It has, on the whole, been of incalculable advantage to the Church that it should be so; but it has this drawback, that, as it is only fair and natural that the ablest men should be selected for the highest posts, the Church is sometimes deprived of its best champions in the field of literature. It used to be said, 'Make a bishop, and spoil a preacher.' This certainly cannot be said now, for some of our best preachers have been, and still are, found in the episcopal ranks; but it *might* be said, 'Make a bishop, and'—not 'spoil,' but 'cripple a writer'; for anything like sustained and continuous study appears to be physically impossible for the modern prelate. His must be the *βίος πρακτικὸς*, not the *βίος θεωρητικὸς*, though some have contrived to a marvellous extent to combine the two.

There were two ways of relieving the over-taxed bishops: (1) By the subdivision of dioceses, a process

which has gone on more rapidly during the last fifty years than it has ever done since the days of Archbishop Theodore. Ripon, Manchester, Wakefield, St. Albans, Liverpool, Truro, Southwell, Newcastle, are all new sees created during our period. But these did not sufficiently meet the wants of the case; and the erection of a new diocese is necessarily a slow and costly process; so another plan has been adopted, not to supersede, but to supplement the more regular, ancient and satisfactory plan of appointing more diocesan bishops, viz.: (2) By appointing suffragans. The expediency of reviving this office had long been talked of; it remained for Bishop Christopher Wordsworth to turn words into deeds. There is no reason why it should not have been done before, for there was an Act of Henry VIII. which authorized their appointment, still unrepealed; but it had fallen into abeyance soon after it had been placed on the Statute Book, and through lapse of time and habitual desuetude came to be regarded as a dead letter. Through the exertions of Bishop Wordsworth, supported by the Premier, Mr. Gladstone, the Act was put into force again in 1870, and Henry Mackenzie was consecrated Suffragan Bishop of Nottingham. The example has been widely followed, and there are now twenty so-called suffragan bishops in the Church of England.

Passing from dignitaries to 'the inferior clergy,' the Church has surely had, not a better, but a better-trained set of officers. The Universities themselves have become secularized; but the Churchmen in them have become more alive to the duty of providing the future clergy with facilities for learning their work. Such men as King, Liddon, Bright,

Christopher and Chavasse at Oxford, Lightfoot, Westcott and Moule at Cambridge; such institutions as Keble College, Pusey House, Selwyn College, Ridley Hall, Wiclif Hall, S. Stephen's House, have given aids towards the making of good parish priests which the elders among us never enjoyed. The Theological School at Oxford and the Theological Tripos at Cambridge tend to the same result. And when the degree in Arts is won, there is a choice of no less than fourteen theological colleges, an institution unknown sixty years ago, in which the neophyte may receive a more specifically professional training before he plunges, all raw and untried, into the unspeakably responsible duties of a parochial clergyman.

Turning from the staff to what may be called the plant, rearrangements have been made which have certainly been conducive to the efficiency of Church work. Nothing, for instance, tended more to lessen the interest of a Bishop in his diocese than the prospect, and in fact the hope, that he might only be a bird of passage there. Such autobiographies as those of Thomas Newton, Bishop of Bristol,[1] and Richard Watson, Bishop of Llandaff,[2] give extreme instances of a restless feeling which must have been more or less prevalent when bishoprics were of very unequal value, and when the system of translation from one bishopric to another was generally, and perhaps under the circumstances fairly, adopted. But the *Episcopal Act* of 1836 nearly equalized the revenues of all sees except Canterbury, York, London, Winchester and Durham; and, as a corollary, the

[1] 'Life of Dr. Newton, by himself.'

[2] 'Anecdotes of his Life by Bishop R. Watson,' published by his son.

bad system of translations was abolished. There is no longer the temptation to a Bishop to indulge that feeling that he has not found his permanent home, which is most antagonistic to clerical work. When a Bishop is now appointed to a see, he knows that *there* he must remain, in all probability, to the end of his life, and so he can put his whole heart and soul into the work of his diocese. Even worse than the custom of translating bishops was that of suffering them to hold, in combination with their bishoprics, deaneries, canonries and benefices *in commendam;* and that is now entirely a thing of the past.

The *Pluralities Act* of 1838 had a similar effect in tending to secure the interest of parish priests in their parishes. Without entering into details, it may be regarded as an almost self-evident proposition that a man cannot do his work properly unless he is on the spot; and hence the broad results of the Pluralities Act, which simply aimed at preventing a clergyman from undertaking cures to which he could not possibly attend in person, have been eminently beneficial. An increase of services, both on Sundays and weekdays, organizations of all sorts for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the people, are the natural outcome of the residence of a faithful pastor among his flock. It is true that there are, and always have been, certain *mauvais sujets* among the clergy who had better be non-resident than resident. To get rid of these altogether is one of the most important, but most difficult, problems which the Church has yet to solve; but these exceptions only prove the rule that a resident clergyman is a blessing. A totally-neglected parish is a much rarer spectacle now than it was sixty years ago; various attempts

have been made to render it rarer still; among which are the *Benefices Resignation Act* of 1870, which provides for the retirement of aged and infirm incumbents, with a pension charged upon the living; various Church Patronage Bills; and the *Pluralities Act Amendments Bill;* but there is still much to be done in this direction.

The most vigorous efforts have been made to keep pace, not only with the increased population, but with its centralizing tendency, which is a characteristic of the present age, by providing church accommodation and parochial machinery. One great effort in this direction was made in 1843, when the Prime Minister, Sir Robert Peel, imposed on the fund of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners a charge of £30,000 a year for the creation of 200 new districts in large towns, with a stipend of £150 (too small) for the minister in each place.[1] But far more has been effected by voluntary effort, either through the agency of societies such as the *Additional Curates Society*, the *Church Pastoral Aid Society*, the *Church Building Society*, or by private munificence, or by the general establishment of the weekly offertory. In that gigantic aggregate of towns which we call London, where the population has increased out of all proportion to the rest of the country, the Church has risen nobly to the occasion. During the twenty-eight years of Bishop Blomfield's episcopate (1828-1856) no less than 200 churches were consecrated, and a vast number of schools, parsonages, etc., erected. The *Westminster Spiritual Aid Fund*, founded chiefly by Canon (afterwards Bishop)

[1] For an account of a Peel district, see W. Rogers' 'Reminiscences,' p. 492.

Christopher Wordsworth, Mr. W. Page Wood (afterwards Lord Hatherley), and the Hon. J. C. Talbot, about 1844, has done a world of good in the squalid neighbourhood of London's most beautiful church. The *Bishop of London's Fund*, started by Bishop Tait in 1868, was so warmly welcomed that when the Bishop proposed to aim at raising half a million, the laity present at the meeting suggested as an amendment that they should aim at raising a million; and the scheme was supplemented by Mrs. Tait's Ladies' Diocesan Association. One would like to give instances of liberal and successful efforts in other populous places, notably at Leeds under the incumbency of Dr. Hook, but space forbids. It must suffice to say that it was ascertained in 1875, by a return made to Parliament on the motion of Lord Hampton, that between the years 1840 and 1874 no less a sum than twenty-five millions and a half had been spent on church building and restoration.

Meanwhile Churchmen have not forgotten the truth of the old saying, that the school is the porch of the church. The relative progress of the two rival systems started in the early part of the century, by the National Society, on Church lines, and the British and Foreign School Society, on undenominational lines, shows clearly that Englishmen still have confidence in their National Church. The vigorous and self-denying exertions of the parochial clergy in behalf of education received a warm recognition from an unexpected quarter in 1820, viz., from Mr., afterwards Lord, Brougham.[1]

[1] See Brougham's speech in the House of Commons, quoted in 'The English Church in the Nineteenth Century,' pp. 119-123.

These exertions have certainly not been relaxed, but very greatly increased, in later years. More than once measures have been taken which seemed framed to substitute a secular, or at best an undenominational, for a Church education. When the Government first determined to give a grant in aid of school building and maintenance, many good Churchmen, suspecting the Greeks even when they offered presents, were for standing aloof; but others more wisely determined to qualify the Church schools for claiming their share of the grant, and, very largely through the efforts of a recluse Oxford scholar, Mr. Richard Gresswell,[1] the Church proved equal to the occasion, and raised very large sums, which it wisely disbursed through the agency of the National Society.

The appointment of a Committee of Council on Education, and the insistence upon the insertion of the *Management Clauses* in the trust deeds of Church schools, which required others besides the clergyman to be managers, caused alarm among Churchmen, and prejudiced many against what was called 'placing their schools under Government'; but these alarms were removed without any injury to the Church schools. So, too, was the alarm about the *Conscience Clause*, which stipulated that no religious instruction should be given contrary to the wishes of the children's parents. The conscience clause was not found to be so formidable a weapon as was expected; very few parents chose to take advantage of it, and the Church was able to hold her own without interfering with the perfectly justifiable claims of the consciences of her neighbours. Again, Mr. Lowe's

[1] See Dean Burgon's 'Lives of Twelve Good Men': 'Richard Gresswell,' vol. ii., pp. 99-110.

famous plan of 'payment by results' (1862) seemed likely to be fatal to Church education; for among the 'results' religious knowledge was not counted. Then it was ordered that H.M. Inspector should not inspect the religious knowledge at all; it was neither to be 'a paying subject,' nor yet one in which the teacher could gain even an empty credit. But these attempts, whether intentional or not, to cripple the Church's energies, only succeeded in rousing those energies all the more. The Government requirements were met, and religious instruction was imparted in addition, encouragement being given to it by a well-organized system of diocesan inspection, paid and unpaid, and by the establishment of prize schemes for religious knowledge in most dioceses. Finally, *Mr. Forster's Bill of* 1870, establishing compulsory education, and requiring the erection of Board schools, to be conducted on strictly undenominational lines, when the voluntary schools were not sufficient, seemed to deal a deathblow to the Church system. Could Churchmen be reasonably expected to pay the enforced rate and yet support the voluntary schools as well? However unreasonable, experience has shown that they *could;* the result has been only to quicken the interest in Church education, and to render it more efficient than ever; but while comparatively few instances have occurred of Church schools being swallowed up by Boards, there still is a necessary tendency in that direction, and Churchmen, who have saved the State an enormous expense, are still awaiting some measure of common justice.[1]

Middle-class education is not in a satisfactory

[1] Since the above was written, *some* measure has come.

state, but in the attempts to make it so Churchmen have taken the lion's share. The *Woodard Schools*, first established by an excellent clergyman, the Rev. N. Woodard, in 1848, and since then largely extended by him, with the able assistance of Canon Lowe, through different parts of the country, are among the best of their kind; most of them are for the middle classes, but one, Lancing College, is, like Radley and Bradfield, intended for the higher, and these three rank now with our best public schools, though not so large.

One vitally-important matter in which the Church has made great progress during the last half-century is that of mission work, both home and foreign. As we have seen, the missionary spirit in the Church of England was largely revived in the early part of the nineteenth century. But the distinctive feature of Anglican Christianity had been strangely lacking. Up to the year 1825 there were only five colonial and no missionary bishops. By 1840 the number had risen to ten, and then an impetus was given by one who was ever to the front in practical Christian work. The Bishop of London (Dr. Blomfield) wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Howley) to the effect that, in his opinion, the time had arrived when a great effort should be made in behalf of the Church in the colonies, and especially in the matter of appointing colonial bishops. The Archbishop responded warmly, and in the early part of 1841 a meeting was held in Willis's Rooms, when a splendid start was made for founding a *Colonial Bishopric Fund*. The S.P.C.K. gave £10,000, the S.P.G. £7,500, the Queen-Dowager (Adelaide) £2,000, and the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of

London £1,000 each, while the C.M.S. promised £600 a year towards a New Zealand bishopric.[1] Dr. G. A. Selwyn was consecrated first Bishop of New Zealand October 17, 1841, and for twenty-five years worked in that distant land with such vigour and success, such courage, tact, and ability, as have rarely been equalled, never surpassed, in the mission-field. Five more colonial bishops were consecrated on S. Bartholomew's Day, 1842, and twenty more within the next twenty years. In 1861, after very considerable difficulties, chiefly technical, the first missionary bishop was appointed. Oddly enough, the impulse came from one who had not been brought up as a Churchman. David Livingstone, the African missionary and explorer, had gone forth under the auspices of the London Missionary Society; but it was he who, in 1859, first suggested the *Universities' Mission to Central Africa*. The scheme was warmly advocated by Bishop Gray, of Capetown, who chanced to be in England at the time, and Dr. C. F. Mackenzie was consecrated Bishop of Central Africa January 1, 1861; but he fell a victim to the unwholesome clime, dying of a fever, January 31, 1862. In 1861 the see of Honolulu was founded on the petition of the King of Hawaii, who had been deeply impressed by Christian teaching; then those of Melanesia, Bloemfontein, and Zululand; then the first coloured bishop, Dr. Samuel Crowther, was consecrated Bishop of the Niger country; and in 1871 the sad murder of Bishop Patteson gave another episcopal martyr to the mission cause, to be followed a few years later by the martyrdom of Bishop Hannington. The

[1] Perry, iii. 247.

principle on which mission work is done by the English Church may now be said to have been changed. The old plan was, first to gather a number of converts, and then to set a bishop over them; the new, and surely the more reasonable and Church-like plan, is to start a mission with a bishop at its head at the outset.

A grand demonstration (if the expression may be allowed) of the extension and proper organization of Anglican Christianity took place in 1867, when seventy-six bishops of the Anglican communion from all parts of the world met at Lambeth, at the invitation and under the presidency of Archbishop Longley, whose courtesy and good judgment peculiarly qualified him to preside over so unique an assembly. In his letter of invitation to the various bishops, Dr. Longley expressly said: 'Such a meeting would not be competent to make declarations or lay down definitions on points of doctrine; but united worship and common councils would greatly tend to maintain unity of faith.' He thus answered by anticipation the criticisms which afterwards appeared, to the effect that the *Pan-Anglican Conference* had done nothing. It *did* do what it was intended to do. The testimony of seventy-six bishops to 'the faith as taught in the Scriptures, held in the primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils,' was as weighty an utterance as any that had been made since there *was* a General Council; and the Encyclical put forth, affirming the inspiration of the Bible and the very Godhead of Christ, was not unneeded.[1] The experiment was

[1] The conference arose out of the Colenso case. See 'Life of Dean Stanley,' ii. 196, etc.

repeated on a larger scale, and with as successful results, under Archbishop Tait, in 1878. The encouragement given to work in the foreign mission-field by such gatherings, showing as they did the compactness and unity of the great Anglican communion, need not be dwelt upon.

But there was mission work to be done at home as well as abroad. The regular Church services, beautiful and spiritual as they are, need to be supplemented by a rougher and more irregular machinery if the vast masses, who are practically heathen, are to be touched. It was the recognition of this fact that was the secret of Wesley's success in the eighteenth century. He saw, as he said, that there were thousands who no more belonged to the Church of England than to the Church of Muscovy, and he sought them out and spoke to them, either by himself or by his agents, in language that they could understand. The case was not very different in the nineteenth century, and the Church, instead of leaving it to irregular workers, wisely put aside her 'respectability,' and 'went forth into the highways and hedges and compelled them to come in.' Bishop Wilberforce was the first to start the plan of holding parochial missions, and his diocese of Oxford has the honour of being the first in which such missions were held.[1] Dr. Tait, when he was Bishop of London, laid great stress upon this kind of work, preaching himself out of doors, and establishing a London Diocesan Home Mission; while London clergymen

[1] Wantage, Farringdon, and Banbury were the three first places in which parochial missions were held, in Lent, 1850. See Mr. R. W. Daniels' monograph on Bishop S. Wilberforce, p. 54 English Leaders of Religion Series).

of very different views from those of their diocesan, such as Mr. Lowder, at S. Peter's, London Docks, and Mr. Mackonochie at S. Alban's, Holborn, did what was essentially mission work in their poor and crowded districts in a most effective fashion. A Church Parochial Mission Society was founded, and gave a great stimulus to the work in all parts of the country. In some dioceses 'diocesan missionaries' were appointed, who were to give their whole time to the work, and in some cases a residentiary canonry has very properly been attached to the office.

One of the distinctive features of the period before us is the revival, and, indeed, the large extension, of united action. The want of this was a grievous defect of the Georgian era, and was only too conspicuous when the Methodist movement arose. Each parish priest for himself in his own parish, and each Bishop for himself in his own diocese, had to deal with the problem, which was really a very difficult and complicated one, and the natural result was—disaster.

There was, indeed, a certain amount of united action through voluntary societies; but this was for some one specific purpose, not for the settlement of Church questions generally. The attempt to establish a really united action was commenced, as was meet and right, by a revival of the Church's proper, constitutional assemblies, whose active functions had been in abeyance for more than a hundred years. *The revival of Convocation* was urged as early as 1840 by Samuel Wilberforce, then the young Archdeacon of Surrey. An abortive attempt was made in 1847, when the Dean of Canterbury (Dr. Lyall) was elected Prolocutor, and a motion was proposed 'that the Queen be petitioned that Convo-

cation might be permitted to consult on the best means of increasing the efficiency of the Church'; but the motion was lost. The Hampden and Gorham cases, especially the latter, greatly stimulated the desire of Churchmen to see the Church's provincial synods revived, and in 1850 a Society for the Revival of Convocation (which had been projected as early as 1847) was founded, Mr. Henry Hoare being the very energetic chairman of its executive committee.[1] There was really no inherent difficulty in the matter; no fresh law was needed, nor the abolition of any old law. Armed with the royal license, Convocation might resume its active functions at any time. But there was opposition within as well as without the camp. The agitation for revival was supposed to emanate from 'the Puseyites,' and was therefore opposed by Evangelicals, Liberals, and that large class of *laissez-faire* people which is an element that always has to be reckoned with. Then there was the question, 'Were laymen to be admitted?' It was, no doubt, very desirable that laity and clergy should consult together about Church matters, but any assembly in which such consultation took place could not be Convocation, and Convocation was what it was desired by Churchmen to revive. Again, the two archbishops, who alone could summon the synods of their respective provinces, were timid and half-hearted in the matter. And once more, the scheme was rumoured not to have found favour in high

[1] See 'Memoir of Henry Hoare,' by J. B. Sweet, *passim*. Samuel Wilberforce and Henry Hoare are the two names that are more connected than any others with the revival of Convocation, and it is curious that both men belonged by their descent and their early training to the Evangelical party, which steadily opposed its revival.

quarters. Bishops Blomfield, Wilberforce, and Philpotts, however, and a lay peer, Lord Redesdale, pushed the matter vigorously forward in the House of Lords. In 1852 it found a friend in the new Prime Minister, Lord Derby; and on November 12, 1852, the Convocation of Canterbury met for the first time since 1717 for the despatch of business. York did not follow suit until the death of Archbishop Musgrave in 1860. His successor, Dr. Longley, at once summoned a meeting of the Northern Convocation; its revival was greatly due to the persistent efforts of Canon Trevor. The *Provincial Synods*, having once been re-established, will never, it is hoped, again be suspended from active work, but they might well be reformed on strictly constitutional lines. The Southern Convocation, which must always be the larger and more important of the two, is at present far less of a representative assembly than the Northern, the official element being much stronger and the representation of the parochial clergy much weaker in proportion; but a canon is now in process of being framed[1] which will largely increase the numbers of proctors for the clergy. The next step in both provinces will probably be to extend the franchise beyond the limits of the beneficed clergy, making the privilege of a vote to depend upon the '*of*ficium, not upon the *bene*ficium.' Then the dictum of the 139th canon, 'The Sacred Synod of this nation, in the name of Christ, and by the King's authority assembled, is the true Church of England by representation,' will be more truly realized than it now is. The establishment of a *House of Laymen* to act

[1] Since the above was written, it *has* been framed. It will come into force at the next election.

concurrently with Convocation took place later than the period to which this work is limited.

The *Diocesan Synod* is as much a part of the Church's constitution as the provincial; indeed, it is the more ancient of the two, the diocese being older than the province, which is simply an aggregation of dioceses.[1] In 1851 a Diocesan Synod was held by Bishop Philpotts at Exeter to consider what was to be done about the Gorham Judgment. This was, however, not quite after the ancient pattern, as it consisted of *representatives* of the clergy, while it was of the essence of the old Diocesan Synod that the Bishop should summon *all* the clergy who were exercising their ministerial functions in his diocese. Of course, to a certain extent the Diocesan Synod is represented by the episcopal Visitations; but these are but a very poor substitute: the mere fact that they are necessarily held at different centres deprives them of the imposing solemnity which attends one united gathering.[2] The first and only true Diocesan Synod during our period was that called by the Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Wordsworth) in 1870; it was successful, but the experiment has not been repeated. Perhaps one reason of the non-revival of these most ancient and constitutional Church assemblies is, that debate is quite out of place in them,[3]

[1] See Bishop Christopher Wordsworth's 'Miscellanies,' i. 156, note.

[2] For some excellent remarks on Diocesan Synods, see Canon J. Wayland Joyce's 'England's Sacred Synods,' ch. ii. His striking account of the Diocesan Synod held at Hereford in 1519 suggests a painful contrast to the modern episcopal Visitation. He specifies several which have been held since the Reformation, as well as twenty-nine between the Conquest and the Reformation.

[3] See Bishop Wordsworth's 'Miscellanies,' i. 157, 162.

and in these days of hot discussion debate is thought a *sine qua non*. At any rate, it has been found highly useful at other Church assemblies, which have been more popular, though less regular, than those mentioned above.

In 1861 the first *Church Congress* was held in the hall of King's College, Cambridge. It was very far from reaching the proportions which have been since attained; in fact, it was in the first instance only intended to be local, being simply a meeting of the Cambridge Church Defence Society; but it was so promising that the experiment was repeated in 1862 at Oxford, when it received a great impetus from the presidency of Bishop Wilberforce; and since that time it has gone on year by year increasing in popularity and usefulness. It is a perfectly open assembly of clergy and laity, the only restriction being that the readers and speakers must be *bonâ-fide* members of the Church of England. The system of selected speakers and readers has enlisted the services of some of the ablest men of the day, while that of allowing anyone to speak who sends up his card, and is approved by the chairman, has secured a free debate.

Not only have the gloomy forebodings that such a miscellaneous assembly would tend to excite bitterness, and probably also to cause a collision between the clergy and the laity, been utterly falsified by the event; but the very opposite results have ensued. Nothing has tended more to make Churchmen of one party recognise the good side in Churchmen of another party, or to bring clergy and laity more into harmony, than these annual gatherings. Those of different sentiments, tastes, and habits, but all bound

by one common bond of loyalty to their mother-Church, have been brought face to face, and have found that they had more in common than they thought. Angles have been rubbed off, and prejudices mitigated, if not dispelled. By the wise insistence of Bishop Wilberforce, there has been no voting, which would have been sure to produce unnecessary contention; but burning questions have never been shirked, and each year a more Christian spirit has been shown in the discussion of the most delicate points of difference between fellow-Churchmen.

The *Diocesan Conference* arose from the same source as the Church Congress, and the chief originator of both, Archdeacon Emery, is still living to see the extraordinary success of his energetic and most judicious labour. Archdeacon Emery was strongly supported by his diocesan, Bishop Harold Browne, under whose presidency the first conference was held in the diocese of Ely in 1863; and the example has been followed in almost every diocese in the kingdom. As in the Church Congress, selected speakers and readers are taken from the clergy and the laity, and a general discussion follows; but the constitution of the assembly differs in different dioceses. The Diocesan Conference is, of course, more or less a meeting of neighbours, and it has done much to bridge over the gulf between Churchmen who ought to be on neighbourly terms. It has also tended to mitigate the evils of 'parochialism,' and to make Churchmen realize that the diocese, not the parish, is the unit of the Church system.

It is impossible to notice ever so briefly the countless agencies for Church work which have been either

originated or greatly extended and improved during the last half-century. One of the most remarkable outgrowths of the period has been that of sisterhoods, the revival of which roused at first the utmost suspicion and alarm; but the great value of them is now almost universally recognised. The first was established in 1848 through the influence of Dr. Pusey in the neighbourhood of Regent's Park, the Rev. William Dodsworth, then the Incumbent of Christ Church, S. Pancras, being the director; then followed the much larger establishment presided over by Miss Sellon at Devonport, the beneficent work of which was perseveringly carried on in the face of the most violent opposition; then the Clewer Sisterhood, the founder and staunch supporter of which, Canon Carter, is still among us, and has given us a most touching account of the first superior, Harriet Monsell; then the sisterhood at Wantage, founded and tended with loving care up to the very close of his life by William Butler, the indefatigable Vicar of Wantage, and afterwards Dean of Lincoln. Among other sisterhoods are that of St. John the Evangelist at Westminster, founded in 1848; that at East Grinstead, founded by Dr. J. M. Neale, Warden of Sackville College, and Miss S. A. Gream in 1856; and the Home at All Saints', Margaret Street, first presided over by Mrs. Lancaster, one of the most effective supporters of sisterhoods. The Church has also grappled, as she never grappled before, with the crying evils of intemperance and impurity. The *Church of England Temperance Society*, founded in 1862, has not only brought such influence as the Church alone could wield to bear upon what has truly been called 'our national vice,' but also, by

its enlightened and reasonable modes of working, dispelled the prejudices which undoubtedly existed among many against temperance work, on the ground that it was the work of fanatics and faddists. Canon Ellison, who was the real founder of the society, and has been its backbone from the commencement, is still spared to see the result of his labours. The *White Cross* or *Church Purity Society* has done a work which, from the nature of the case, is not easy to measure; but if the Church had not undertaken such work she would have grievously neglected her duty. For an account of her other agencies, her nursing institutions, her reformatories, her penitentiaries, her missions to seamen, and her work among the naval and military population generally; her homes for waifs and strays, her ragged schools, her quiet days and retreats for clergy, and sometimes also for laity; her circulation of pure literature through the book-hawking and other associations; her organization of lay readers, Scripture-readers, and deaconesses; her mission to the navvies on railways, and other good works which show how thoroughly alive she is to her responsibilities, the reader must be referred to that most valuable and much-needed volume, 'The Official Year-Book of the Church of England.'

One question naturally suggests itself in conclusion: If what has been written in the latter half of this chapter is even approximately true, is not the present a strange time to agitate for the disestablishment and disendowment of an institution which has so good a record to show? Of course, no true Churchman thinks for a moment that any action on the part of the State can injure the Church as a spiritual,

Divinely-appointed society. Her position in that capacity would be precisely the same as it is now if she were disendowed, or, in plain words, robbed, of what is on the most obvious principles of property rightfully her own. But will not the nation think twice—yea, thrice—before it cuts itself adrift *as* a nation from the oldest, the grandest, the most practically-useful society that exists in the land? *It is the oldest.* It was 'established,' not by the State, for there *was* no one State to establish anything, but by its own inherent force, when this land was nothing but a congeries of different and often hostile tribes. There has been no break in its continuity from that day to this; for the theory that a new Church was erected in the sixteenth century is one that has been consigned by all competent historians, some of whom are very far indeed from holding a brief for the Church, to the limbo of exploded fallacies. *It is the grandest.* 'There are not many grand things left in England,' said the late Lord Beaconsfield in his old age, 'but the National Church is one of them.'[1] An illustration may be borrowed from one of its own buildings. Pull down an old Gothic cathedral, or one of those grand old parish churches which are dotted about the country. No amount of money, skill, or taste, can raise one like it in its place. The new erection may be more garish, but not so grand. There will be something lacking which only time and hallowed associations with the past can give. *It is the most practically useful.* Its antiquity and its grandeur might be regarded as too sentimental a consideration for this utilitarian age; but put it on the lowest grounds of

[1] Introduction to 'Lothair.'

utility, and surely it would be a most suicidal policy to destroy it. Of the many great schemes of practical usefulness which have been started and successfully carried out by Englishmen, how many are there of them of which the National Church could not say, 'Quorum pars magna fui'? Observe the absurd disproportion between the sums contributed by Churchmen to almost any benevolent object of general interest, and those contributed by all other societies put together; take away what has been given by Churchmen, and how much will be left?

Now, it is idle to deny that, if the Church were despoiled, the first duty of her children would be to see that their spiritual mother did not suffer for want of support, just as it is the first duty of earthly children to support their earthly parents; they must not say to her, 'It is Corban, by whatsoever it is that thou mightest be profited by me.' One result then undoubtedly would be that the stream of Churchmen's liberality would flow into a different channel, and 'charities' (in the popular sense of the term) would suffer to an extent which it is difficult tc calculate.

In short, we have a splendid machinery for doing good ready at hand in our National Church. Are we going deliberately with our own hands to break that machinery in pieces? If such a piece of wanton destruction is to be perpetrated, it is the State that will suffer far more than the Church. The Church can do perfectly well without the State; whether the State can do equally well without the Church remains to be seen.

But looking back through the long vista of ages stretching away for thirteen centuries, one cannot

but feel sure that the same God who has so marvellously protected His Church in the past through all its varied fortunes will still protect it in the future. Over and over again the English Church has seemed to be within a hair's-breadth of destruction; but it has never been destroyed. Hardly a century has elapsed without some crisis in its eventful history. The heathen Danes seemed likely to sweep away every vestige of it from off the land; the Normans all but reduced it to a mere appanage of Rome; King John, its official guardian, basely betrayed it to the foreigner; in the civil wars of the fifteenth century it was sunk into the last stage of impotency and decrepitude; there were times many in the sixteenth century when it appeared in imminent danger of breaking off altogether from historic Christianity; in the seventeenth it passed through a period of twenty years' occultation; in the Georgian era it seemed to have settled upon its lees, and to have sunk into a state of stagnation; in the first half of the nineteenth it was regarded by very many as a doomed institution; in the second half it has been frequently predicted that a society so torn by internal dissensions could not possibly survive. But God has preserved it still; and we may humbly hope that He will never allow its candlestick to be moved out of its place, but that, under the Divine blessing, it will continue to flourish, until at last the Church Militant be swallowed up in the Church Triumphant.

# LIST OF AUTHORITIES.


Abbey, C. J.: The English Church and its Bishops (1700-1800).

Abbey and Overton: The English Church in the Eighteenth Century.

Aids to Faith (various writers).

Aikin, J.: Memoirs of John Selden and Archbishop Ussher.

Aldhelmus: Opera quæ extant (ed. J. A. Giles).

Andrewes, Bishop Lancelot: Sermons (Lib. of Anglo-Cath. Theol.).

" " Tortura Torti.

" " Responsio ad Apologiam Card. Bellarmini.

Answers to Essays and Reviews (various writers).

Arnold, Dr. T.: Essays on Reform.

" Life, by Stanley.

Asserius: Alfredi Regis Res Gestæ (ed. M. Parker).

Atterbury, Bishop F.: Memoirs and Correspondence, compiled by Folkestone Williams.

" " Sermons and Discourses.

" " Life, by Stackhouse.

Baines, J.: Life of Archbishop Laud.

Baker, T., Life of.

" History of S. John's College, Cambridge (ed. J. E. B. Mayor).

Barlow, W.: Conference of James I. with the Bishops at Hampton Court.

Barrow, Isaac: Theological Works, with Life by Whewell (ed. Napier).

Barwick, P.: Vita Joannis Barwick.

Becket, Archbishop T., Lives of, by Robert of Gloucester (ed. Black), Hope, Robertson, etc.

Bede: Ecclesiastical History (tr. J. A. Giles).

„ Two Lives of S. Cuthbert.

Benedict of Peterborough (?): Gesta Regis Henrici (Rolls Series, ed. Stubbs).

Benson, A. C.: William Laud—a Study.

Berkeley, Bishop G.: Works, with Life by A. C. Fraser.

Beveridge, Bishop W.: Theological Works (Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.).

Bilson: Perpetual Government of Christ His Church.

Bingham, Joseph: Works, with Life (ed. J. R. Pitman).

Birch, T.: Life of Archbishop Tillotson.

Blaauw, W. H.: The Barons' War.

Blomfield, C. J.: Memoir of, etc. (ed. by his son).

Blunt, J. H.: The Reformation of the Church of England.

Blunt, J. J.: History of the Reformation of the Church of England.

Bonifacii: Opera Omnia (ed. Giles).

Boultbee, T. P.: History of the Church of England. Pre-Reformation Period.

Boyer, A.: Annals of the Reign of Queen Anne.

Bradley, E. T.: Annals of Westminster Abbey.

Bray, T., Public Spirit illustrated in the Life and Designs of.

Brewer, J. S.: Reign of Henry VIII.

„ Monumenta Franciscana (ed.).

Bridgett: Life of Blessed John Fisher.

Bright, W.: Chapters of Early English Church History.

„ Waymarks of Church History.

Brodrick, G. C.: Memorials of Merton College (Oxford Hist. Soc.).

Brougham, Henry, Lord: Life and Times, written by himself.
Brougham, Henry, Lord: Contributions to the *Edinburgh Review*.
Brokesby, F.: Life and Works of Henry Dodwell.
Browne, Bishop G. Forest: Augustine and his Companions.
Bull, Bishop G.: Works, with Life by R. Nelson.
Burgon, Dean: Lives of Twelve Good Men.
Burnet, Bishop G.: History of his Own Times.
„ „ History of the Reformation (ed. N. Pocock).
Burrows, Montagu: Wiclif's Place in History.
„ „ Collectanea (Oxford Hist. Soc.).
Burton, J. Hill: History of the Reign of Queen Anne.
Butler, Bishop J.: Works, with Preface by Bishop Halifax (Lives, see *sub nominibus*).

Calamy, Edmund: Account of his Life and Times (ed. Rutt).
„ „ The Nonconformists' Memorial (Ejected Ministers).
Calendar of State Papers, etc., from Venice and North Italy (Rolls Series).
Calendar of Letters and State Papers, etc., in Archives of Simancos (Rolls Series).
Calendar of State Papers of Reign of Henry VIII.
Camden: Life of Elizabeth.
„ Annals of James I.
Carwithen, J. B. S.: History of the Church of England to the Revolution.
Chandler: Life of Bishop Waynflete.
Church, Dean: Saint Anselm.
„ „ The Oxford Movement.
Churton, E.: The Early English Church (Englishman's Library).
„ Memoir of Joshua Watson.
Clarendon, Earl of: History of the Great Rebellion.
Colenso, Bishop: Works, and Life by Sir G. W. Cox.

Coleridge, Sir J. T.: Memoir of J. Keble.
Collier, Jeremy: Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain.
Copleston, Bishop: Memoir, etc., by W. J. Copleston.
„ „ Remains, with Introduction and Reminiscences of Archbishop Whately.
Cosin, Bishop: Works (Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.).
„ „ Correspondence, etc. (Surtees Soc.).
„ „ Vita Cosini, T. Smith.
Coxe, W.: Memoir and Correspondence of John, Duke of Marlborough.
Croly, G.: Life of George IV.
Cruttwell, C.: Life of Bishop T. Wilson.

Dawes, Archbishop Sir W., Works and Memoir of.
Defoe, D.: History of the Great Plague in London.
„ Account of Societies for Reformation of Manners.
Denison, G. A.: Notes of my Life, 1805-78.
Denton, W.: England in the Fifteenth Century.
Dixon, R. W.: History of Church of England from Abolition of Roman Jurisdiction.
Dixon, W. H.: Fasti Eboracenses, Lives of Archbishops of York (ed. Raine).
Dodd: Church History.
D'Oyly, G.: Life of Archbishop Sancroft.
Dugdale: Monasticon Anglicanum.

Eadmer: Vita S. Anselmi.
„ Historia Novorum in Angliâ, etc. (ed. Rule).
Echard, L.: History of England from Julius Cæsar to William and Mary.
„ History of the Revolution.
Eddius: Vita S. Wilifridi.
Elmes, J.: Sir Christopher Wren and his Times.
Epistolæ Cantuarienses (ed. Stubbs).
Essays and Reviews (1860).

Evelyn, John: Memoirs, comprising Diary and Letters (ed. Bray).

Farrar, A. S.: Critical History of Free Thought (Bampton Lectures).
Fell, Bishop: Life of Dr. R. Allestree.
Field, Dean: Of the Church.
Florence of Worcester: Chronica, etc.
Forster, C.: Life of Bishop Jebb.
Fowler, T.: History of Corpus Christi College, Oxford (Oxford Hist. Soc.).
Fox, C. J.: History of the Early Part of the Reign of James II.
Fox, S.: Monks and Monasteries.
Foxe, John: Acts and Monuments of the Christian Martyrs.
Freeman, E. A.: History of the Norman Conquest.
„ „ English Towns and Districts.
Froude, J. A.: History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.
„ „ Letters, etc., of Erasmus.
Froude, R. H., Remains of.
Fuller, T.: Church History of Britain.
„ Worthies of England.

Gairdner, J.: Memorials of Henry VII.
„ Houses of York and Lancaster (Epochs of Mod. Hist.).
Gardiner, S. R.: History of England (various volumes and titles, all in the Stuart period).
Gascoigne, T.: Dictionarium Theologicum.
„ Loci e Libro Veritatum (from G.'s Theol. Dict., ed. J. E. T. Rogers).
Gasquet, F. A.: The Last Abbot of Glastonbury and his Companions.
Gervase of Canterbury: Historical Works (ed. Stubbs, Rolls Series).
Gesta Stephani, etc. (ed. R. C. Sewell, Eng. Hist. Soc.).

Gildas, surnamed the Wise, Works of.
Giraldi Cambrensis Opera (ed., vols. i.-iv., J. S. Brewer, vols. v.-vii., Dimock ; Rolls Series).
Gledstone, J. P. : Life and Travels of G. Whitefield.
Gibson, Bishop E. : Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani.
„ „ Preservative against Popery.
Granville, Dean Denis, Works and Letters of (Surtees Misc.).
Gray, Bishop R., of Capetown, Life of (ed. C. Gray).
Green, J. R. : Short History of the English People.
„ „ The Making of England.
Grey Friars at Oxford (ed. Little, Oxford Hist. Soc.).
Grosseteste, Bishop R. : Epistolæ (ed. H. R. Luard).
„ „ Life, by Archdeacon Perry.

Hacket, Bishop : Scrinia Reserta—Memorial of Archbishop Williams.
Haddan and Stubbs : Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents, etc.
Hallam, H. : Europe in the Middle Ages.
„ Constitutional History of England.
„ Introduction to the Literary History of the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries.
Hammond, H. : Thirty-one Sermons ; Practical Catechism ; Life by J. Fell (Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.).
Hampden, Bishop R. D. : Scholastic Philosophy and Christian Theology (Bampton Lectures).
Hampden, Bishop R. D. : Memorials of, by Henriette Hampden.
Hawkins, Ernest : Historical Notices of Missions of Church of England, etc.
Hardwick, C. : History of the Christian Church during the Reformation.
Hayward : Life of Edward VI.
Hearne, T. : Collections (Oxford Hist. Soc. ; several vols.).
Henry of Huntingdon : Historia Anglorum (ed. T. Arnold, Rolls Series).

Henry of Huntingdon : Acts of King Stephen.
Heylin, P. : Cyprianus Anglicus (Life of Archbishop Laud).
Hill (O'Dell Travers) : English Monasticism.
Historic Winchester : Bramston and Le Roy.
Hoadly, Bishop B. : Works and Life, published by his son.
Hoare, Henry, Life of, by J. B. Sweet.
Hoddesdon : History of Sir Thomas More.
Hodgson : Life of Bishop B. Porteus.
Holinshed, R. : Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland.
Hook, Dean : Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury.
,, ,, Life and Letters of, by W. R. W. Stephens.
Hooker, R. : Works with Life by Walton, arranged by J. Keble.
Horne, Bishop G. : Works, with Life by W. Jones, of Nayland.
Horsley, Bishop S. : Sermons, Charges, Letters, Tracts, etc.
Hore, W. : The Church in England from William III. to Victoria.
Huber, V. A. : History of the English Universities (from the German, ed. F. W. Newman).
Hugh, S., of Avalon, Bishop of Lincoln : Magna Vita (ed. Dimock, Rolls Series).
Hugh, S., of Avalon, Bishop of Lincoln, Life of, by Archdeacon G. G. Perry.
Hunt, J. : Religious Thought in England.
Huntingdon, Selina, Countess of, Life and Times of.
Hurd, Bishop : Works, with Life by himself.
Hutton, W. H. : William Laud (English Leaders of Religion Series).
,, ,, Sir Thomas More.

Isaacson : Life of Bishop Andrewes.

Jesse, J. H. : Memoirs of the Court of England during the Reigns of the Stuarts.
,, ,, Memoirs of the Court of England from the Revolution to the Death of George II.

Jesse, J. H.: Memoirs of the Life and Reign of King George III.
Jewell, Bishop: Works (ed. Jelf).
John of Salisbury: Opera Omnia (ed. Giles).
Johnson, John, of Cranbrook: Theological Works (Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.).
Jones, W., of Nayland: Works, with Life by W. Stevens.
Joyce, J. W.: England's Sacred Synods—a History of the Convocation.
,, ,, The Sword and the Keys; The Civil Power in its Relation to the Church.
Jebb, Bishop J.: Thirty Years' Correspondence with Alexander Knox.
,, ,, Life by Forster.

Kaye, Bishop J., Works of (ed. by his son).
Keble, J., Memoir of, by Sir J. T. Coleridge.
,, Life by Lock (English Leaders of Religion Series).
,, Life of Bishop T. Wilson.
,, Christian Year, Sermons, and other Works.
Kemble, J. M.: Saxons in England.
Ken, Bishop T.: Prose Works, with Life by Hawkins.
,, ,, Life of, by Canon Bowles.
,, ,, Life of, by a Layman.
,, ,, Life of, by Dean Plumptre.
Kennet, Bishop White: Complete History of England.
,, ,, Complete History of Convocations.
Kettlewell, J., Complete Works of, with Life.
Kidder, Bishop: Life of Dr. Horneck.
Knight, S.: Life of Dean Colet.
Knox, Alexander: Remains (Correspondence, see Jebb).

Lanfranci Opera (ed. Giles).
Lathbury, T.: History of the Nonjurors.
,, History of the Convocations of the Church of England.

Laud, Archbishop: Works (Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.). (Lives by Heylin, Baines, Le Bas, 'Romish Recusant,' Simpkinson, Hutton. See *sub nominibus*.)
Law, W.: Works (Life by Tighe, Overton, etc.).
Le Bas, C. W.: Life of Archbishop Laud.
„ „ Life of Bishop Middleton.
Lechler, G. V.: John Wiclif and his English Precursors (tr., with notes, by Lorimer).
Lecky, W. E. H.: History of England in the Eighteenth Century.
Lee, F. G.: Historical Sketches of the Reformation.
„ „ The Church under Queen Elizabeth.
Le Neve, J.: Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ.
Leslie, C.: Theological Works.
„ Life and Writings of, by R. J. Leslie.
Letter to a Convocation Man.
Lewis, J.: Lives of Wiclif and Pecock.
Lingard, J.: Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church.
„ History of England to the Revolution (10 vols.).
Lloyd, Bishop W.: Historical Account of Church Government in Great Britain, etc.
Lock: J. Keble (Leaders of Religion Series).
Longman, W.: History of Life and Times of Edward III.
Lowth, Bishop R.: Life of William of Wykeham.
Luttrell, Narcissus: Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September, 1678, to April, 1714.
Luckock, Dean: The Bishops in the Tower.
Lyte, H. C. Maxwell: History of Eton College (1440-1875).
Lyttelton, George, Lord: History of Henry II.

Macaulay, Lord: History of England from the Accession of James II.
„ „ Critical and Historical Essays.
Mackintosh, Sir J.: Life of Sir Thomas More.
Maitland, S.: Essays on Subjects connected with the Reformation in England.

Makower, F.: Constitutional History of the Church of England.
Mapes, Archdeacon Walter: De Nugis Curialium, etc. (ed. Wright, Camden Soc.).
Marsh, W. H.: Memoir of Bishop Juxon and his Times.
Massey, W.: History of England during the Reign of George III.
Massingberd, F. C.: History of the Reformation of the English Church (Eng. Lib.).
Matthew Paris: Chronica Majora (ed. Luard, Rolls Series).
" " Historia Anglorum sive Historia Minor (ed. Madden, Rolls Series).
Maurice, F. D.: Philosophy of the First Six Centuries.
" " Life, by Colonel Maurice.
" " Theological Essays.
Milman, H. H.: History of Latin Christianity.
" " History of the Jews.
Milner, Dean I.: Life of, by Mrs. Mary Milner.
Milner, Joseph: History of the Church of Christ.
" " Life, by I. Milner (prefixed to Practical Sermons of).
Moberly, G. H.: Life of William of Wykeham.
Montalembert: Monks of the West.
More, Hannah: Works, in 11 vols.; Lives of, by Roberts, Thompson, and C. M. Yonge).
Monumenta Franciscana (ed. J. S. Brewer, Rolls Series).
Moore, Aubrey: History of the Reformation.
Mozley, J. B.: Essays, Historical and Theological.
" " Letters of.
Mozley, T.: Reminiscences, chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement.
Mullinger, J. Bass: University of Cambridge (2 vols.).

Nares: Life of Lord Burleigh.
Neal, Daniel: History of the Puritans.
Nelson, R.: Life of Bishop Bull.

Nelson, R.: Secretan's Life of.
Nennius: History of the Britons.
Newell, E. J.: History of the Welsh Church.
Newman, Cardinal J. H.: Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ.
,, ,, ,, Correspondence (ed. by Anne Mozley).
Newton, John: Works, with Memoir by Cecil.
Newton, Bishop T.: Life by himself.
Nicholls: Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century.
,, Literary Illustrations of the Eighteenth Century.

Official Year-Book of the Church of England.
Oliphant, Mrs.: Historical Sketches of the Reign of George II.
Ottley, R. L.: Lancelot Andrewes (Eng. Rel. Leaders Ser.).
Overall's Convocation Book (Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.).
Overton, J. H.: Life in the English Church (1660-1714).
,, ,, William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic.
,, ,, Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century (Epochs of Ch. Hist. Series).
,, ,, The English Church in the Nineteenth Century (1800-1833).
,, ,, John Wesley (Leaders of Rel. Series).
Owen, John: Works, with Life by Orme.

Palin, W.: History of the Church of England (1688-1717).
Palmer, Sir W.: Narrative of Events connected with the Publication of 'The Tracts for the Times.'
Pater, W.: Studies in the History of the Renaissance.
Paterson, Pietas Londinensis.
Patrick, Bishop S., Autobiography of.
Pearce, Bishop Z., Life of, by himself.
Pearson, C. H.: History of England during the Early and Middle Ages.
Pearson, Bishop J.: Minor Theological Works, with Memoir of Author (ed. Churton).

Pecock, Bishop R.: Repression of Over-blaming the Clergy (ed. Churchill Babington).

Pennington, A. R.: Life of Erasmus.

" " Recollections of Persons and Events.

" " John Wiclif, his Life, Times, and Teaching.

Perry, Archdeacon G. G.: Students' Manual of English Church History.

" " " Life of S. Hugh of Avalon.

" " " Life of Bishop Grosseteste.

" " " History of the Reformation in England (Epochs of Ch. Hist. Series).

Phillimore, J. G.: History of England during the Reign of George III.

Phillimore, Lucy: Sir Christopher Wren, his Family and his Times.

Phillpotts, Bishop H.: Life, Times, and Writings of, by R. Shute.

Plume: Life of Bishop Hacket (ed. Mackenzie Walcott).

Pope, W.: Life of Bishop Seth Ward.

Porteus, Bishop Beilby: Works, with Life by R. Hodgson.

Potter, Archbishop J.: Antiquities of Greece, with Life by Dr. Anderson.

Procter, F.: History of the Book of Common Prayer.

Prynne, W.: Histrio-Mastix: the Players' Scourge.

" Canterburie's Doome; Breviate of the Life of Laud; Hidden Works of Darkness brought to Public Light (all bound up together).

Pusey, E. B.: Life by Canon Liddon, etc.

Raine, J.: Historians of the Church of York and its Archbishops.

Ranke, L. von: History of England principally in the Seventeenth Century.

Richard of Cirencester: Speculum Historiale (ed. J. E. B. Mayor).
Richard of Devizes: Chronicle, etc. (tr. Giles).
Roger of Hoveden: Chronica (ed. Stubbs).
Roger of Wendover: Chronica (ed. H. O. Coxe, Eng. Hist. Soc.).
Rogers, J. E. T.: Loci e Libro Veritatum (Gascoigne).
Rogers, W., Reminiscences of.
Romaine, W.: Works, with Memoir.
'Romish Recusant': Life of Archbishop Laud.
Ryder, Bishop, Charges of.
Ryle, Bishop: Christian Leaders of the Eighteenth Century.

Sacheverell, Dr., Compleat History of the Affairs of.
Salmon: Lives of the English Bishops from the Restoration to the Revolution.
Sanderson, Bishop R.: Works (ed. Jacobson).
„ „ Life of, by I. Walton.
Scott, T.: Works, and Life by his Son, J. Scott.
Searle: History of Queens' College, Cambridge.
Secker, Archbishop: Works, and Life by Bishop B. Porteus.
Secretan, C. F.: Life and Times of the Pious Robert Nelson.
Seebohm, F.: Oxford Reformers of 1498.
Selwyn, Bishop G. A.: Memoir of his Life and Episcopate, by H. W. Tucker.
Sharp, Archbishop J., Sermons, and Life of, by his Son (ed. T. Newcome).
Sherlock, Bishop T.: Works, with Life by T. S. Hughes.
Shirley, W. W.: Fasciculi Zizaniorum Joannis Wyclif (Rolls Series).
Short, Bishop T. V.: History of the Church of England.
Simeon of Durham: Historical Works (Rolls Series).
Simpkinson, C. H.: Life and Times of Archbishop Laud.
Spencer, O. L.: Life of Archbishop Chichele.

Spratt, Bishop: History of the Royal Society.
Stanley, Dean A. P.: Life and Correspondence of Dr. T. Arnold.
Stanhope, Earl: History of England.
Stapleton: Tres Thomæ.
Stephen, Sir J.: Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography.
Stephen, Leslie: History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century.
Stillingfleet, Bishop E.: Origines Britannicæ.
Stoughton, J.: Church of the Restoration.
,, Church of the Revolution.
,, Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges.
,, Religion in England from 1800 to 1850.
Stowell, Hugh: Life of Bishop T. Wilson.
Strickland, Agnes: Lives of the Seven Bishops committed to the Tower.
Strype, J.: Annals of the Reformation.
,, Lives of Cranmer, Parker, Grindall, Whitgift, Aylmer, etc.
Stubbs, Bishop W.: Constitutional History of England.
,, ,, Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum.
,, ,, Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History.
,, ,, The Early Plantagenets (Epochs of Modern History).
,, ,, Introduction, Prefaces, etc., to many volumes in the Rolls Series.
Swift, Dean J.: Last Four Years of the Reign of Queen Anne; and other works.

Tait, Archbishop A. C., Life of.
,, ,, Seven Addresses on the Present State of the Church; and other works.

Taylor, Bishop Jeremy: Whole Works of, with Life by R. Heber.
„ „ Life of, by R. A. Wilmot.
Teale, W. H.: Lives of English Laymen (Eng. Lib.).
Tenison, Archbishop, Life of (writer anonymous).
Thirlwall, Bishop T. Connop, Life and Letters of.
Thomas of Elmham.
Thomas of Walsingham.
Thoresby, Ralph: Diary (1677-1728).
Todd, J. H.: Life of Bishop Brian Walton.
Tracts for the Times.
Trench, Archbishop R. C.: Lectures on Mediæval Church History.
Tucker, H. W.: Life of Bishop Selwyn (see Selwyn).
„ „ Under His Banner—Papers on Missionary Work.
„ „ The English Church in other Lands (Epochs of Ch. Hist.).
Turner, Sharon: History of Anglo-Saxons.
„ „ History of England during the Middle Ages.
„ „ Reign of Henry VIII.
„ „ Reign of Edward VI., Mary, Elizabeth.
Twell: Life of E. Pocock.
Tyerman, L.: The Oxford Methodists.
„ Life of John Wesley.
„ Life of G. Whitefield.

Ussher, Archbishop: Britannicæ Ecclesiæ Antiquitates.
„ „ Lives of, by R. Bernard, R. Parr, T. Smith, J. Aikin.

Van Mildert, Bishop: Life of D. Waterland, prefixed to Works.
Vaughan, R., Life and Opinions of John de Wycliffe.
Venn, H., Works and Life of.

Venn, H. (the younger): History of Church Missionary Society.

Wakeman, H. O.: The Church and the Puritans (Epochs of Ch. Hist. Series).

„ „ Introduction to the History of the Church of England.

Walker, J.: Sufferings of the Clergy.

Walton, I.: Lives of Donne, Wotton, Hooker, Herbert, Sanderson, etc.

Ward, A. W.: The Counter-Reformation (Ep. Ch. Hist. Series).

Ward, Wilfrid: Life of his Father.

Warburton, Bishop W.: Works, with Life prefixed (ed. by Bishop Hurd).

„ „ Life by J. S. Watson.

Waterland, D.: Works, with Life by Van Mildert.

Watson, Bishop R.: Anecdotes of his own Life, published by his Son.

Wedgwood, Julia: John Wesley and the Evangelical Reaction in the Eighteenth Century.

Wesley, J.: Works, esp. Journal.; Lives of, by Coke and More, Southey, Tyerman, Watson, Denny Urlin, Hockin, Overton, Telford, Wedgwood.

Westminster Abbey, Annals of, by E. T. Bradley.

„ „ Memorials of, by A. P. Stanley.

Whately, Archbishop R.: Works, *passim*, and Life, by E. Jane Whately.

Whewell, W.: History of the Inductive Sciences.

Whitefield, G., Lives of, by Gledstone, Tyerman, Philip, Andrews.

„ Sermons, Letters, and Journal.

Wilberforce, W., Life of, by his Sons.

„ Practical View, with Memoir prefixed.

Wilberforce, Bishop S., Life of, by Ashwell, continued by R. Wilberforce.

Wilberforce, Bishop S., R. W. Daniel (English Leaders of Religion Series).
Wilkins, D.: Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ.
William of Malmesbury: Gesta Regum Anglorum (ed. T. D. Hardy, Eng. Hist. Soc.).
„ „ Gesta Pontificum (Rolls Series).
William of Newburgh: Historia Rerum Anglicarum (Rolls Series).
Williamson, Bishop W.: English Reformation (Paddock Lectures).
Williams, Isaac, Autobiography of (ed. Sir G. Prevost).
Wilson, D., Bishop of Calcutta, Life of, by J. Bateman.
Wilson, T., Bishop of Sodor and Man, Lives of, by Cruttwell, H. Stowell, J. Keble.
Wood, Anthony: Athenæ Oxonienses (ed. Bliss).
„ „ Life and Times of (Oxford Hist. Soc.).
Woodhouse, R. J.: Life of Archbishop Morton.
Wren, Sir C., Life of, by J. Elmes.
„ Life of, by Lucy Phillimore.
Woodward, Josiah: Account of the Religious Societies.
Wordsworth, Bishop Charles: Account of his Own Life.
Wordsworth, Chr. (Master of Trinity): Ecclesiastical Biography.
Wordsworth, Chr. (Bishop of Lincoln): Miscellanies.
„ „ Life of, by E. Wordsworth and J. H. Overton.

Yates: The Church in Danger.

Zurich Letters.

# INDEX.

*Names only casually mentioned have not been included. As a rule, individuals have been described by the highest title to which they attained; but in cases in which they are universally known by a lower title, that title has been given.*


A.

ABBOT, George, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 19, 21-25, 30, 48, 57, 70
Abbot, Robert, Bishop of Salisbury, ii. 48
Abingdon, Monastery of, i. 136-138, 186
Abjuration Oath (1701), ii. 194
Adam de Marisco, Friar, i. 239, 240
Adda, i. 55
Additional Curates' Society, ii. 404
Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Clerical (1834), ii. 319
Ad Murum, i. 55, 56
'Advertisements,' The, of 1566, i. 465; ii. 376
Agatho, Pope, i. 80
Agilbert, Bishop of Dorchester, i. 50, 60, 61, 69, 72
Aidan, Saint, i. 42-46, 69
Alban, Saint and Martyr, i. 6
Albert, Archbishop of York, i. 108, 153
Alchfrid, son of Oswy, i. 54, 60, 62
'Alciphron; or, The Minute Philosopher,' Berkeley's, ii. 224, 225
Alcuin, i. 109, 111, 153
Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne, i. 83, 97-100
Aldred, Archbishop of York, i. 157, 160, 171
Alfred, King, i. 120-126
Alien priories, i. 146, 257, 301
Allegories, High Church, ii. 347
Allen, William, Cardinal, i. 455, 456
Allestree, Richard, ii. 120, 148
'Alliance between Church and State,' Warburton's, ii. 256
All Souls' College, Oxford, Foundation of, i. 314
Alphege the Bald, Bishop of Winchester, i. 130
Alphege, Saint, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 140-142, 168
'Analogy,' Butler's, ii. 222-224
Andrewes, Lancelot, Bishop of Winchester, ii. 21, 26, 41-44, 46, 64
Anglo-Norman Church, Vigour of, i. 169
Animus against the Church (1820-1833), ii. 305-308
Anna, King of East Anglia, i. 50, 53
Annates and first-fruits, i. 372, 375, 376, 441
Anne, Queen, ii. 195-210
Anselm, Saint, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 168, 174-184, 201, 324
Antinomianism, ii. 265
Antonius de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro, ii. 46
Apostolical Succession, Doctrine of the, ii. 322
'Appello Cæsarem,' Montague's, ii. 57, 58
Arianism in Britain, ii. 8, 9
Ariminum, Council of, i. 8
Arles, Council of, i. 4, 7
Arminianism, ii. 30, 32, 47, 259, 265
Arnold, Thomas, Headmaster of Rugby, ii. 312, 313, 393
Articles, The Forty-two, i. 407
Articles, The Thirty-nine, i. 450, 451, 455; Newman on, ii. 336, 337; Ward on, ii. 340

Articles of Discipline, Whitgift's, i. 476
Arundel, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 296, 298, 299, 301-303
Asaph, Saint, i. 14
Asser, Bishop of Sherborne, i. 120-122, 125, 127
Association of Friends of the Church (1833), ii. 319
Athanasian Creed, Agitation against the, ii. 371, 372
Athelney, Monastery of, i. 122
Athelstan, King, i. 127, 128, 130
Atterbury, Francis, Bishop of Rochester: On Convocation, ii. 187; sermons, 206, 217; trial and exile, ii. 240-243
Augustine, Saint, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 19-31
Augustine's, Saint, Canterbury, i. 26, 83, 107, 219
Augustine Canons, i. 188
Austin Friars, i. 236
Avignon, residence of Popes, i. 261
Aylmer, Bishop of London, i. 475, 476
Aymer de Valence, Bishop of Winchester, i. 242

B.

Bacon, Roger, Friar, i. 232, 240, 241
Bacon, Sir Nicholas, i. 433-435, 442
Badby, John, Lollard, i. 303
Bagot, Richard, Bishop of Oxford, ii. 338
Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 219
Bamborough, i. 43, 45, 92
Bancroft, John, Bishop of Oxford, ii. 73
Bancroft, Richard, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 481; ii. 10, 16, 20
Bangor, i. 14
Bangor-Iscoed, i. 28, 29
Bangorian Controversy, The, ii. 227-229
Baptismal Regeneration, Doctrine of, ii. 352
Bardney, Monastery of, i. 118, 151
Bari, Council of, 179
Barlow, William, Bishop of Chichester, i. 437, 438
Baro, Peter, i. 482
Barons' Wars, The, i. 234, 235
Barrow, Isaac, Bishop of S. Asaph, ii. 112
Barrow, Isaac, Master of Trinity, Cambridge, ii. 148
Bartholomew's, Saint, Day, Massacre on, i. 456; Act of Uniformity, ii. 141
Barton, Elizabeth, Holy Maid of Kent, i. 376, 378
Barwick, John, Dean of St. Paul's, ii. 44, 112, 148
Barwick, Peter, ii. 112
Basle, Council of, i. 321
Bastwick, John, ii. 74, 76
Bates, William, ii. 130
Battle Abbey, i. 166
Baxter, Richard, ii. 130, 133, 135, 136
Beaufort, Henry, Cardinal, Bishop of Winchester, i. 307, 308
Becket, Saint Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 197-211, 217
Bede, The Venerable, i. 5, 9, 15, 28, 29, 32, 46, 47, 57, 64, 70, 72, 80, 100-104, 152
Bell and Lancaster Controversy (education), ii. 295, 296
Bellarmine, Cardinal, ii. 26
Benedict Biscop, i. 72, 94, 95, 100, 118, 152
Benedictine Rule, The, i. 96, 118, 133, 137, 166
Benefices Resignation Act (1870), ii. 404
Benefit of clergy, i. 202, 203, 371, 372
Bennett, J. W. E., at S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and S. Barnabas, Pimlico, ii. 358
Benson, E., Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 399
Benson, Martin, Bishop of Gloucester, ii. 237, 247
Bentley, Richard, Master of Trinity, Cambridge, ii. 220
Berkeley, George, Bishop of Cloyne, ii. 215, 224
Berridge, John, of Everton, ii. 260-262, 264, 265
Bertha, Queen, i. 20
Betti, i. 55
Beveridge, William, Bishop of S. Asaph, ii. 148, 156, 177, 208
Bible, Wiclif's, i. 286, 287, 388
Bible, Tyndale's, i. 387
Bible, Coverdale's, i. 388
Bible, Bishops', ii. 13
Bible, Authorized Version, ii. 12-15
Bill, William, Dean of Westminster, i. 445
Bilson, Thomas, Bishop of Winchester, i. 481; ii. 14, 40, 44
Bingham, Joseph, ii. 207

Birinus, Apostle of Wessex, i. 48, 49
Bishop of London's Fund (1868), ii. 403
Bishoprics erected out of monastic revenues, i. 384
Bishops withdraw from House of Lords (1641), ii. 99, 100
Bishops' restoration to House of Lords, ii. 138
'Bishops' Book' (1537), i. 389
Bisi, Bishop of East Anglia, i. 77
Blackall, Offspring, Bishop of Exeter, ii. 204
'Black Book' (Henry VIII.), i. 380; (George IV.) ii. 304
Blackmore, Sir Richard, ii. 192
Blomfield, C. J., Bishop of London, ii. 357, 358, 404, 408, 414
Böhler, Peter, ii. 236
Boisil, Prior of Melrose, i. 91
Boleyn, Anne, i. 358, 365, 373, 385
Bolingbroke, Viscount, philosophical works, ii. 223
Boniface, Saint, Apostle of Germany, i. 104, 105, 111
Boniface of Savoy, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 243
Bonner, Edmund, Bishop of London, i. 367, 398, 412, 422, 439, 446
'Book of Sports' (James I.), ii. 29; (Charles I.) ii. 71, 72
Bosa, Bishop of York, i. 82, 83
Bosham, Monastery of, i. 85
Boyle Lectures, ii. 194
Bradford, John, i. 403, 421, 473
Bradwardine, Thomas, i. 267, 268
Bray, Thomas, ii. 156, 191-194
Breda Declaration (Charles II.), ii. 130
Brent, Sir Nathaniel, ii. 73, 113
Brett, Thomas, nonjuror, ii. 240
Bridges, John, Dean of Salisbury, i. 477
Bright, W., Canon, i. 2, 49, 58, 154
Brigittites, i. 378
British Church, i. 1-16, 24, 27-29
*British Critic, The*, ii. 291, 330, 340
*British Magazine, The*, ii. 346
Broad Church, The, ii. 391-393
Browne, Harold, Bishop of Winchester, ii. 417
Brownrigg, Ralph, Bishop of Exeter, ii. 96, 117, 122
Bucer, i. 402
Buchanan, Claudius, ii. 296, 397
Buckeridge, John, Bishop of Ely, ii. 40, 47, 48, 58
Bull, George, Bishop of S. David's, ii. 121, 212, 226
Bullinger, i. 403, 447, 463
Burke, Edmund, ii. 286, 287
Burnell, Robert, Chancellor of Edward I., i. 253, 258
Burnet, Gilbert, Bishop of Salisbury, ii. 171, 172, 183, 184, 188, 192, 198
Burton, Henry, ii. 74, 78
Busby, Richard, Headmaster of Westminster, ii. 124
Butler, Joseph, Bishop of Durham, ii. 222-224, 237, 238, 247, 253
Button (or Bitton), William, Bishop of Bath and Wells, i. 248

C.

Cadwalla, British King, i. 40
Cædmon, poet, i. 96, 97, 152
Caerleon-on-Usk, i. 6, 7
Calchith (Chelsea), Councils of, i. 113, 116
Calendar, Act for correcting (1753), ii. 250
Calne, Council of, i. 134
Calvinism, i. 475, 481, 482; ii. 23, 30-32, 259, 260, 264, 265
Cambridge and the Renaissance, i. 345
Cambridge and the Puritans, i. 466-468
Cambridge and the Great Rebellion, ii. 112
Cambridge and the Evangelical Movement, ii. 276-279
Cambridge and the Oxford Movement, ii. 345
Campion, Edward (Jesuit), i. 456, 457
Canon Law, i. 196-198, 203
Canons of 1603, ii. 10, 12
Canons of 1640, ii. 77, 78, 88
Canterbury, Supremacy of, i. 163, 183, and *passim*; Diocese of, *passim*
Cantilupe, Thomas de, Saint, Bishop of Hereford, i. 247, 248
Cantilupe, Walter de, Bishop of Worcester, i. 234, 246
Canute, King, i. 120, 142-144
Cardinal's College, Oxford, i. 341, 343
'Cardiphonia,' John Newton's, ii. 267
Carlisle, Diocese of, i. 185
Carmelites (White Friars), i. 236
Caroline of Anspach, wife of George II., ii. 247
Caroline of Brunswick, wife of George IV., ii. 302-304
Carte, Thomas, nonjuror, ii. 240

Carthusian Order, i. 188, 213, 378
Cartwright, Thomas, i. 451, 467-469, 474
Casaubon, Isaac, ii. 26, 40, 45, 46
Catechism, Cranmer's, i. 399
Catechism, Nowell's, i. 448; ii. 8.
Catechism, The Church, ii. 8
Catechism, Westminster, ii. 110
*Catenæ Patrum* (in 'Tracts for the Times'), ii. 323
Cathedral Act (1840), ii. 394, 398
Cathedral system, improvements in Victorian era, ii. 397-400
Catholicity of English Church, ii. 33-35, 46, 47
Cave, William, ii. 111, 208
Cecil, Richard, ii. 268, 273
Cecil, Sir William (Lord Burghley), i. 433, 434, 457
Cedd, Saint, Bishop of East Saxons, i. 46, 55-58, 60
Celibacy of clergy, i. 166, 167
Celtic Christianity, i. 45, 46, 58-65, 78
Ceolfrid, Abbot of Jarrow, i. 100, 101
Ceolnoth, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 115
Chad, Saint, Bishop of Lichfield, i. 46, 69, 73-75, 88-90
Chadderton, ii. 9
Chantries, Suppression of, i. 395
Charenton, Presbyterian services at, ii. 129
Charity Schools, ii. 193, 209
Charles I., King, ii. 55-63, 94, and *passim*
Charles II., King, ii. 126-157
Charlotte, Queen, ii. 252, 253
Charter, The Great, i. 228, 229
Charters, King Stephen's, i. 194
Cherry, Francis, ii. 176, 239
Chester-le-Street, i. 119
Chichele, Henry, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 292, 305 307, 313, 314
Children's services, ii. 397
Chillingworth, William, ii. 70
Christ Church, Canterbury, Monastery of, i. 206, 218, 219, 226, 243, 328
Christ Church, Oxford, i, 384, 392
Christ's College, Cambridge, Foundation of, i. 348
Christ's Hospital, i. 409
*Christian Observer, The*, ii. 262, 263, 274, 275
'Christian Year,' Keble's, ii. 328
'Christianity not founded on Argument,' ii. 222, 223
Chubb, Thomas, Deist, ii. 222
Church, R. W., Dean of St. Paul's, i. 184; ii. 342
Church Building Society, ii. 298-300
'Church and King' riots at Birmingham, ii. 300
'Church in Danger,' ii. 199, 201, 202, 309, 310
Church Congresses, ii. 416, 417
Church of England Temperance Society, ii. 418, 419
Church Missionary Society, ii. 282, 283, 296, 298, 409
Church system of worship carried out, ii. 396
*Circumspecte Agatis*, statute, i. 257
Cistercians, The, i. 186-189, 195, 201, 207, 212, 314
Clandestine Marriage Act (1753), ii. 250
'Clapham Sect,' The, ii. 271-276, 282
'Clapton Sect,' The, ii. 292-294
Clarendon, Council of, i. 204-206
Clarendon, Edward Hyde, Earl of, ii. 130, 137
Clarendonian Code, ii. 138-143
Clarke, Samuel ('Scripture Doctrine of Trinity'), ii. 226
Classical Studies, Revival of, i. 326, 327, 346, 347
Clergy, Training of future, ii. 401, 402
*Clericis Laicos*, Bull of Pope Boniface VIII., i. 255, 257
Cloveshoo, Councils of, i. 78, 79, 111, 113
Cluniac Order, i. 186
Cobham, Lord. See 'Oldcastle'
Coifi, heathen priest, i. 37, 38
Colenso, J. W., Bishop of Natal, ii. 365-369
Colet, John, Dean of S. Paul's, i. 330-334, 350
Colleges founded instead of monasteries, i. 319, 323, 341, 379, 384
Collier, Jeremy, nonjuror, ii. 240
Collins, Anthony, Deist, ii. 220
Colman, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 60-63
Colonial Bishopric Fund (1841), ii. 408
Colonial Episcopate, ii. 211, 212
Columba, Saint, i. 12, 60
'Complete Duty of Man,' Venn's, ii. 266
Comprehension Schemes, ii. 180-183

Compton, Henry, Bishop of London, ii. 159, 161, 162, 173, 182, 189, 191, 193
'Conclusions,' Lollards', i. 297, 298
'Conclusions,' Pecock's, i. 309
Confirmation, Discussion on, at Hampton Court Conference, ii. 7
Conformists not Churchmen, ii. 143, 144
Conn, Papal Legate, ii. 75
Conscience Clause, The, ii. 406
Constance, Council of, i. 306, 321
Constantine, Emperor, i. 8
Constantius, Cæsar, i. 6
Constitutions of Archbishop Arundel, i. 301, 312
Constitutions of Clarendon, i. 205, 206
Constitutions of Otho, i. 230
Constitutions of Ottoboni, i. 248, 249
Conventicle Act, First (1664), ii. 142, 143
Conventicle Act, Second (1670), ii. 151, 152
Convocation, Nature of, i. 253-256
Convocation, Silencing of, in 1717, ii. 215-218
Convocation, Revival of in Victorian era, ii. 412-415. (For the work of Convocations at different periods, see under head of different reigns)
Conybeare, John, Bishop of Bristol, ii. 222, 248
Cooper, Thomas, Bishop of Winchester, i. 477
Copleston, E., Provost of Oriel, Bishop of Llandaff, ii. 312
Corman of Northumbria, i. 37; of Iona, i. 42
Corporation Act (1661), ii. 139, 140
Corpus Christi College, Oxford, Foundation of, i. 345
Cosin, John, Bishop of Durham, ii. 38, 60, 80, 86, 112, 135, 146, 147
Country Committees of the Long Parliament, ii. 106, 107, 112
Court of Arches, ii. 359, 364
Court of Delegates, ii. 353
Courtenay, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 265, 274, 284, 286, 296
Coverdale, Miles, Bishop of Exeter, i. 388, 403, 637
Cowper, William, poet, ii. 270, 271
Cox, Richard, Bishop of Ely, i. 440, 448, 451
Cranmer, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 359, 363-366, 371-374, 377, 415, 416, 425-428
Crediton, See of, i. 165
Cromwell, Oliver, ii. 114-119
Cromwell, Thomas, i. 366, 367, 378-380, 384, 391
Crowland, Abbey of, i. 118, 172, 185
'Cruciata,' Wiclif's, i. 294
Crusades, The, i. 189, 219-222, 251; ii. 197, 198
Cumberland, Richard, Bishop of Peterborough, ii. 174
Cuthbert, Saint, i. 43, 90-93, 119, 152

D.

Dalderby, John, Bishop of Lincoln, i. 259
Danelagh, i. 121
Danes, Incursions of the, i. 114, 117, 121, 122, 128
Daubeny, Charles, ii. 293
Davenant, John, Bishop of Salisbury, ii. 25, 31
David, Saint, i. 12
Dawes, Sir William, Archbishop of York, ii. 204
Day, George, Bishop of Chichester, i. 405, 412
Deans and Chapters, Bill to abolish, ii. 92
'Declaration' prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles (1628), ii. 65
Declarations of Indulgence (Charles II.), ii. 142, 152
Declaration of Liberty of Conscience (James II.), ii. 161, 162
Defacement of Churches by Puritans, ii. 91, 92
*Defensio Fidei Nicænæ*, and other works on the Trinity, Bull, ii. 226
*De Hæretico Comburendo*, Statute (1401), i. 300, 418; ii. 19
Deists, The, ii. 188, 219-225
'De Juramento Arnaldi,' Wiclif's, i. 273
Dering, Sir Edward, ii. 87, 90
Despondency of Church in the Reform era, ii. 307-310
Deusdedit, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 69 *n.*, 70
Development of Doctrine, Newman on, ii. 343, 344
Dinoth, Abbot, i. 28
Diocesan Conferences, ii. 417
Diocesan Synods, i. 76; ii. 415, 416
Directory for Public Worship (1644), ii. 108, 109
Discipline, Church, i. 84; ii. 246
Dispensing power of the Crown, ii. 161

Ditcher *v.* Denison, ii. 359, 360
Diuma, Bishop, i. 55
'Divine Legation of Moses,' Warburton's, ii. 224, 256, 257
Divine Right of Kings, Doctrine of, ii. 153, 154, 168, 213
Divorce, Henry VIII.'s, i. 358, 373, 374
Dodwell, Henry, nonjuror, ii. 176, 207, 239
Dolben, John, Archbishop of York, ii. 120, 145
Dominicans (Black Friars), i. 236, 237, 241
Donne, John, Dean of S. Paul's, ii. 45
'Dooms of Ina,' i. 98, 151
Dorchester, See of, i. 49, 127
Dort, Synod of, ii. 31
Douai, English College at, i. 455
Dubricius, i. 11
Dudley, John, Duke of Northumberland, i. 401, 402, 405
Dunstan, Saint, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 129-136, 138, 140, 153
Dunwich, See of, i. 52, 127
Duppa, Brian, Bishop of Salisbury, ii. 80, 96, 123

E.

Eadbald, King of Kent, i. 34, 47
Eadmer, i. 184, 191
Ealdstan, Bishop of Sherborne, i. 117
Eanfleda, i. 151
Early English Church, Characteristics of, i. 149-155
Earthquake Council, The, i. 284
East Anglia, The Church in, i. 51-53
Easter, The date of, i. 58, 63, 78
Ebba, Saint, i. 152
'Ecce Homo' (Seeley's), ii. 371
Ecclesiastical Commission (1836), ii. 393, 394
Ecclesiastical Courts separated from Civil, i. 164; nature of, i. 362
Ecclesiastical Titles Bill (1850), ii. 354
Edgar the Pacific, King, i. 132, 137
Edmund Ironside, i. 139
Edmund, Saint, King of the East Angles, i. 119, 143
Edmund, King of Wessex, i. 130
Edmund Rich, Saint, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 245, 246
Edred, King of Wessex, i. 131
Edward, King of Wessex, i. 134
Edward the Confessor, i. 144-149, 157, 158
Edward the Elder, i. 126, 127
Edward I., King of England, i. 251-258
Edward II., King of England, i. 259
Edward III., King of England, i. 261-266, 273, 288
Edward VI., King of England, i. 393-410
Edwin, King of Northumbria, i. 34-40
Edwy, King of Wessex, i. 132, 133
Egbert, Archbishop of York, i. 103, 107, 108, 152
Egbert, King of Kent, i. 70
Egbert, King of Wessex (or all England?), i. 115
Egfrid, King of Northumbria, i. 75, 86
Ejected ministers of 1662, ii. 141, 142, 149, 150
Elementary Education and the Church, ii. 294, 295, 405-407. See also under separate heads
Eleutherius, Bishop of West Saxons, i. 77
Elfleda, i. 53, 60, 151
Elfric the Grammarian, i. 137, 139, 140
Elizabeth, Queen, i. 431-484
Ely, Diocese of, i. 183, 185
Ely, Monastery of, i. 118, 137, 152
Emery, Archdeacon, ii. 417
'Engagement,' The (O. Cromwell), ii. 116
Eorpwald, King of East Anglia, i. 51
Episcopal Act (1836), ii. 394, 402
Epworth Rectory, ii. 231, 232
Erasmus, i. 329, 330, 334, 337-339, 347
Erastianism, i. 391; ii. 184
Erconbert, King, i. 47
Erkenwald, Saint, Bishop of London, i. 86, 94
Ermenburga, Queen, i. 79
'Essays and Reviews,' Case of, ii. 360-364
Essex, The Church in, i. 55-58, 67
Estates of the Realm, i. 252, 266
Ethandune, Battle of, i. 121
Ethelbald, King of Mercia, i. 110, 111
Ethelbert, King of Kent, i. 19-22, 26, 31, 32
Ethelbert, King of East Anglia, i. 113
Ethelburga, i. 34, 47, 94
Etheldreda, Saint, Queen, i. 75, 79, 152
Ethelfrid, King, i. 29
Ethelgar, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 138

Ethelhard, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 113
Ethelnoth, i. 143, 144
Ethelred the Unready, King, i. 134, 135, 138, 141
Ethelred, King of Mercia, i. 151
Ethelwalch, King of Sussex, i. 85
Ethelwold, Bishop of Winchester, i. 136, 137, 140
Ethelwulf, King, i. 115-117
Eton College, Foundation of, i. 314, 315
Eucharist, Weekly celebration of the, ii. 396
Evangelical Revival, The, ii. 230-286
Evangelical Revival, The effects of, on the whole Church, ii. 258, 259, 283, 284
Evelyn, John, ii. 192
*Ex Animo* subscription, ii. 16, 17
Exclusion Bill (Duke of York), ii. 153
Exeter, Diocese of, i. 165

F.

Fabrics, Church, i. 169, 170; ii. 155, 205, 395, and *passim*
*Faciens misericordiam*, Bull (Templars), i. 260
Faringdon, Hugh, Abbot of Reading, i. 383
Fathers, Revived study of, at the Renaissance, i. 328, 346
Feckenham, John, Abbot of Westminster, i. 437
Felix, Saint, Bishop of Dunwich, i. 52, 152
Fell, John, Bishop of Oxford, ii. 120, 148
Feoffees for Impropriations, ii. 67
Ferrar, Robert, Bishop of S. David's, i. 424
Ferrar, Nicholas (Little Gidding), ii. 45
Feudalism, i. 227, 251, and *passim*
Field, Dean ('Of the Church'), ii. 27, 36, 37
Field-preaching (Wesley's and Whitefield's), ii. 236
Fifth Monarchy men, ii. 212
Fifty-two new churches, Scheme for building (1710), ii. 205, 131
Final Court of Appeal in doctrine and ritual, ii. 354, 356
Finan, Saint, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 45, 55-58
Fire of London (1666), ii. 155
Fisher, John, Bishop of Rochester, i. 345-349, 358, 363, 376, 377
Fisher the Jesuit, ii. 50-54, 76
Fitzjames, Bishop of London, i. 331
Five-mile Act (1665), ii. 143
'Five Chaplains,' The (India), ii. 397
'Fleet Parsons,' ii. 250
Fleming, Richard, Bishop of Lincoln, i. 309, 318
'Force of Truth' (Scott's), ii. 267
Foreign Mission Work (in Victorian era), ii. 408-411. See also C.M.S., S.P.G., S.P.C.K., etc.
Foreign Protestants and the English Reformation, i. 402, 403, 447, 462, 463
Forster's Education Act of 1870, ii. 407
'Four Tutors,' The, on Tract 90, ii. 337
Fowler, Edward, Bishop of Gloucester, ii. 174, 177
Fox, Edward, Bishop of Hereford, i. 363, 365
Foxe, Richard, Bishop of Winchester, i. 341, 343-345
Frampton, R., Bishop of Gloucester, ii. 174, 177
Franciscans (Grey Friars), i. 236, 237, 241; Observant, 377, 378
Freeman, E. A., i. 14, 153, 167
French Revolution, Effects of, in England, ii. 300
Frewen, Accepted, Archbishop of York, ii. 97, 98, 145
Friars. See 'Mendicant Orders,' 'Franciscans,' 'Dominicans,' etc.
Frisians, Missions to the, i. 80
Froude, R. Hurrell, ii. 318, 321, 323-325, 327, 328
Fulk, Bishop of London, i. 234
Fursey the Monk, i. 52

G.

'Gag for the New Gospell, A' (Montague's), ii. 56
Gallican Church, i. 4-6, 69
Gallican Church, Wake's correspondence with, ii. 244
Gardiner, Stephen, Bishop of Winchester, i. 363, 365, 367, 370, 398, 412, 416, 419, 420, 422
Gascoigne, Thomas, i. 306, 307, 322, 323
Geddington, Council of, i. 221
George I. and II., Kings, ii. 210-250
George III., ii. 251-301
George IV. and William IV., ii. 302-314
Georgia, Wesley in, ii. 234, 235
Gerard, Archbishop of York, i. 182

Germanus, Saint, Bishop of Auxerre, i. 9-13
Gibson, Edmund, Bishop of London, ii. 215, 244, 245
Gilbertine Order, i. 189
Gilbert Foliot, Bishop of London, ii. 206, 215-217
Gildas, British historian, i. 3, 5, 9, 13
Gilpin, Bernard, i. 404
Gisborne, Thomas, ii. 276
Glanville, Joseph, ii. 151
Glastonbury, i. 14, 98, 130, 131, 133, 136, 138, 153, 185, 384, 401
Godmundingham, Witan at, i. 36-38
Godwin, Earl, i. 145-147
Golias, Bishop, i. 212
Good Parliament, The, i. 273
Gorham Controversy, The, ii. 352, 353
Grabe, Ernest, ii. 192
Grammar Schools (Edward VI.), i. 395
Grand Committee of Religion (1640), ii. 104
Granville, Denis, Dean of Durham, ii. 176
Gray, Walter, Archbishop of York, i. 248
Greek, Study of, at the Renaissance, i. 327 *et seq.*
Gregory the Great, Saint, Pope, i. 18-31, 122
Grey, Lady Jane, i. 412, 416
Grimbold, i. 122, 123, 127
Grimshaw, William, of Haworth, ii. 264
Grindal, Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 448, 451, 462, 469, 471, 472
Grocyn, William, i. 328-330, 333, 334
Grosseteste, Robert, Bishop of Lincoln, i. 231-233, 237-240, 243
Grotius, ii. 46
Guest, Edmund, Bishop of Salisbury, i. 451
Guilds, Suppression of, i. 395
Gundulf, Bishop of Rochester, i. 169, 172
Gunning, Peter, Bishop of Ely, ii. 112, 120, 136, 147, 151
Gunpowder Plot, ii. 18, 26, 38
Guthlac, Saint, Hermit of Crowland, i. 111
Guthrum, i. 121

H.

Hacket, John, Bishop of Lichfield, ii. 122, 148, 155
'Hackney Phalanx,' The, ii. 290. See also 'Clapton Sect'
Hadleigh Rectory, Meeting at (1833), ii. 317, 318
Hadrian the Monk, i. 71, 72, 83, 118, 152
Hall, Joseph, Bishop of Norwich, ii. 31, 73, 80, 93, 95, 111, 123
Hallam, Robert, Bishop of Salisbury, i. 306
Hallelujah Victory, i. 10, 11
Hammond, Henry, ii. 122-124
Hampden, John, ii. 114
Hampden, R. D., Bishop of Hereford, ii. 313, 325, 326, 329, 339
Hampden Controversy, The, ii. 351, 352
Hampton Court Conference, ii. 4-10, 12
'Hard Measure' (Bishop Hall), ii. 111
Harding, Thomas, i. 460
Hare, Francis, Bishop of Chichester, ii. 228, 248
Hare, Julius, Archdeacon, ii. 314
Harold, King, i. 148, 157-159
Hatfield, Council of, i. 77, 78
Hatfield Chase, Battle of, i. 40
Hearne, Thomas, antiquary, ii. 240
Heath, Archbishop of York, i. 405, 412, 434, 439, 442
Heath, H. D., ii. 370
Hebdomadal Board, Oxford, ii. 337, 338, 340, 341
Henrietta Maria, Queen, ii. 75
Henry I., King, i. 181-190
Henry II., King, i. 198-213, 219-221
Henry III., King, i. 229-235, 241-244
Henry IV., King, i. 298-300, 302
Henry V., King, i. 302, 303, 307
Henry VI., King, i. 307, 314, 315
Henry VII., King, i. 321-323
Henry VIII., King, i. 332, 349, 350, 353-394
Henry de Blois, Bishop of Winchester, i. 195, 196, 199
Herbert, George, of Bemerton, ii. 45
Hertford, Council of, i. 76-78
Hervey, James ('Meditations'), ii. 263-266
Hevenfeld, Battle of, i. 41
Hexham, Bishopric of, i. 87, 92, 93
Heylin, Peter, ii. 30, 40, 67
Hickes, George, Dean of Worcester, ii. 176, 177, 217, 240
Higbert, Archbishop of Lichfield, . 112
Higham Ferrers, Chichele's charities at, i. 313
High Commission Court (Elizabeth), i. 443-446, 476; (Laud), ii. 69, 94, 139; (James II.), ii. 160, 161, 167

Hilda, Saint, Abbess of Whitby, i. 59, 93, 152
Hildesley, Mark, Bishop of Sodor and Man, ii. 246
Hilsey's Primer, i. 391
'Histriomastix' (Prynne's), ii. 72
Hoadly, Benjamin, Bishop of Winchester, ii. 203, 217, 218, 227-229
Hoare, Henry, ii. 413
Hodgkins, John, Suffragan Bishop of Bedford, i. 437
Holles, Denzil, ii. 89
'Holy Eucharist,' Pusey's sermon on, in 1843, ii. 339
Holy Island, Description of, i. 43, 44
Holy Table, Position of, ii. 49, 71, 85
Homage, Feudal, i. 181, 183, 227
Home mission work in Victorian era, ii. 411, 412
Homilies, First Book of, i. 406
Homilies, Second Book of, i. 450
Honorius, Saint, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 21, 47
Hook, W. F., Dean, ii. 337, 347, 405
Hooker, Richard, i. 478-481; ii. 36, 44
Hooper, George, Bishop of Bath and Wells, ii. 170, 177, 239
Hooper, John, Bishop of Gloucester, i. 404, 413, 419, 420
Hopton, John, Bishop of Norwich, i. 424
Horne, George, Bishop of Norwich, ii. 258, 288-290
Horne, Robert, Bishop of Winchester, i. 449
Horneck, Anthony, ii. 156
Horsley, Samuel, Bishop of S. Asaph, ii. 258, 283, 284, 287, 288, 294
Hough, John, Bishop of Worcester, ii. 160, 174, 248
House of Laymen (Convocation), ii. 414
Howell, Thomas, Bishop of Bristol, ii. 98
Howley, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 408
Howson, John, Bishop of Oxford, afterwards Durham, ii. 58
Hubert, Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 222, 226
Hugh de Wells, Bishop of Lincoln, i. 231
Hugh, Saint, of Avalon, Bishop of Lincoln, i. 213-215
Humanists, The, i. 326
Huntingdon, Selina, Countess of, ii. 260-262, 265
Hurd, Richard, Bishop of Worcester, ii. 257, 258
Hutton, Matthew, Archbishop of York, ii. 5

I.

'Ideal of a Christian Church,' Ward's, ii. 340
Iltutus, i. 11
Impropriate tithes, i. 441, 449
Ina, King of Wessex, i. 98, 114, 151
Indemnity, Act of (from the Test), ii. 257
Independents under Cromwell, ii. 110, 115, 116
Indian Episcopate, ii. 296-298
Ingulf, Abbot of Crowland, i. 172
Injunctions, Royal, Edward VI., i. 398
Injunctions, Royal, Elizabeth, i. 443, 444
Injunctions, Royal, William III., ii. 184, 186, 187
'Institution of a Christian Man' (1537), i. 389
'Instructions,' Laud's (1630), ii. 65-67
Interdict of Kingdom (in John's reign), i. 223, 227
Investiture, Right of, i. 183, 189, 190
Iona, i. 42, 63, 66
Ironside, Gilbert, Bishop of Bristol, ii. 174
Isle of Wight, Conversion of, i. 86
Islip, Simon, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 266

J.

'Jack Sharp's Rebellion' (Lollard), i. 305
Jacobites, The, ii. 213, 240-243, 252, and *passim*
Jaenbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 113
James the Deacon, i. 40
James I., King, ii. 1-32, 45, 49, 50
James II., King, ii. 159-168
Jane, William, Dean of Gloucester, ii. 181, 182
Jarrow, Monastery of, i. 94, 95, 100-103, 106, 118
Jaruman, Bishop of Lichfield, i. 67, 74
Jerusalem, Protestant bishopric of, ii. 342, 343
Jewell, John, Bishop of Salisbury ('Apology,' etc.), i. 459-461; ii. 36, 37

Jews, Persecution of, i. 240, 251
Jews, Bill for Naturalization of (1753), ii. 250
John, Saint, of Beverley, i. 93, 94
John of Crema, Papal Legate, i. 191, 192
John de Grey, Bishop of Norwich, i. 226
John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, i. 269, 273-275, 290
John, King of England, i. 172, 222-229
John of Salisbury, i. 201, 217, 218
John Scotus Erigena, i. 122, 123
Johnson, John, of Cranbrook, ii. 207
Johnson, Samuel, lexicographer, ii. 286
Jones, William, of Nayland, ii. 258, 290, 291
Judicial Committee of Privy Council, ii. 353, 355, 359, 365, 374-377
Justus, Saint, Bishop of Rochester, i. 24, 29, 31, 34
Juxon, William, Bishop of London, ii. 80, 122, 145

K.

Katharine, of Aragon, Queen, i. 358, 364, 373-375
Kaye, John, Bishop of Lincoln, ii. 306, 309
Keble, John, ii. 41, 316, 317, 319, 327, 328, 331, 332
Keble, Thomas, ii. 333, 334
Ken, Thomas, Bishop of Bath and Wells, ii. 148, 156, 162, 174, 177, 208, 239
Kendal, Thomas, Vicar of Louth, i. 381
Kennet, White, Bishop of Peterborough, ii. 117, 187, 192, 248
Kentwine, King of Wessex, i. 98
Kenwalch, King of Wessex, i. 50
Kenwulf, King of Mercia, i. 113
Kettlewell, John, ii. 176
Kidder, Richard, Bishop of Bath and Wells, ii. 274
Kilwardby, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 253, 254
King, Henry, Bishop of Chichester, ii. 96
'King's Book,' The (1543), i. 391
'King's Primer,' The (1545), i. 391
King's College, Cambridge, Foundation of, i. 314, 315
Kingsley, Charles, ii. 390-392
Kingston, Council of, i. 115
Kitchen, Anthony, Bishop of Llandaff, i. 437, 444
Knewstubs, John (Puritan leader), ii. 9
Knights of S. John's (Hospitallers), i. 189
Knights Templars, i. 189
Knights Templars, Suppression of, i. 260, 261
Knox, John, i. 447
'Knoxians and Coxians,' i. 448
Kynegils, King of Wessex, i. 49

L.

Lack Learning Parliament, i. 301
Lake, Edward, Tutor to Princesses Mary and Anne, ii. 186
Lake, John, Bishop of Chichester, ii. 162, 174
Lambeth Chapel (and Laud), ii. 71
Lambeth Articles, i. 481, 482, and *note*
Lambeth, Trial of Wiclif at, i. 278
Laney, Benjamin, Bishop of Ely, ii. 112
Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 161-169, 173-175, 205, 211, 252, 267
Langton, Stephen, Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 226-231
Lastingham, Abbey of, i. 60, 69, 73, 88
Latimer, Hugh, Bishop of Worcester, i. 385, 416, 425-428
Latimer, William, i. 333, 336, 337
Latitudinarian Divines, ii. 177, 178, 310-315, and *passim*
Laud, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 25, 47-54, 58, 61-79, 87-89, 92, 95, 100-102
Laudian Movement, The, ii. 33-54
Laurentius, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 31-34
Law, William, ii. 222, 228-231, 235, 240
'Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity,' Hooker's, i. 478-481
'Lay Declaration of Attachment to Church' (1834), ii. 319
Lay Readers in Elizabeth's reign, i. 450
Lectureships, i. 479; ii. 66-68, 120, 121
Legate, Bartholomew, ii. 19
Legatine Commissions, i. 206 and *passim*
Leicester, Robert, Earl of, i. 464, 465
Leighton, Alexander, ii. 69, 86
Leslie, Charles, ii. 176, 207, 226, 240

'Letter to a Convocation Man' (1697), ii. 187
'Library of the Fathers' (ed. Pusey, etc.), ii. 330
Lichfield, Diocese of, i. 74, 89, 112, 165
Lichfield, Archbishopric of, i. 112, 113
Liddell *v.* Westerton, ii. 358, 359
Lilly, William, i. 335
Linacre, Thomas, i. 333, 335, 336
Lincoln, City of, i. 38
Lincoln, Diocese of, i. 49, 165, 183, 239
Lincoln College, Oxford, i. 318, 319; ii. 232, 233
Lincolnshire, Rising in (1536), i. 381
Lindisfarne, i. 43-45, 92, 118, 119, 151
Liudhard, Bishop, i. 20
Liverpool, Earl of, ii. 299
'Llandaff, Book of,' i. 13, 45
Lloyd, William, Bishop of Norwich, ii. 174, 238
Lloyd, William, Bishop of Worcester, ii. 162
Lollards, The, i. 294-306, 310, 311, 318, 321, 325
London, See of, i. 7, 29, 57
London, a Puritan centre, i. 469; ii. 89, 90, 131
London, an Evangelical centre, ii. 279
Long Parliament, The, ii. 79, 82-93, 115, 116
Longchamp, William, Bishop of Ely, i. 222
Longland, John, Bishop of Lincoln, i. 381
Longley, C. T., Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 410
Lothere, Bishop of Dorchester, i. 51
Lowder, Charles Fuge, ii. 361, 362, 373, 374, 412
Lowth, William, Bishop of London, ii. 258
Lucius, British King, i. 3
Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, i. 9-11
Luther, Martin, i. 357, 370
Lutterworth Rectory, i. 286

M.

Macaulay, Zachary, ii. 275, 282
Mackarel, Abbot of Barlings, i. 381
Mackonochie, A. H., ii. 361, 362, 373, 374, 412
Mackworth, Sir Humphrey, ii. 191
Macmullen, R. G., ii. 339
Macrorie, H. K., Bishop of Pietermaritzburg, ii. 369
Madras System (of Education), ii. 295
Magdalen College, Oxford, Encroachments of James II. on, ii. 160
Magdalen College, Oxford, Foundation of, i. 315-318
Magna Charta, i. 228, 229
Mailduf, Abbot of Malmesbury, i. 97
Maitland, S. R., ii. 345-347
'Malignants,' ii. 106
'Management Clauses' (Church Schools), ii. 406
Manners-Sutton, Charles, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 293, 294, 296, 299
Manning, H., Cardinal, i. 320; ii. 253
Manwaring, Roger, Bishop of S. David's, ii. 59
'Margaret, Lady,' Countess of Richmond and Derby, i. 347, 348
Marian exiles, The, i. 440, 445, 462
Marian persecution, The, i. 417-429
Marlborough influence on Queen Anne, ii. 198, 199, 204
Marprelate Tracts, The, i. 474, 476
Marriott, Charles, ii. 344
Marsh, Herbert, Bishop of Peterborough, ii. 294, 296
Marshall's 'Primer,' i. 391
Martin's (S.)-le-Grand, College of, i. 401
Martin, Saint, of Tours, i. 12
Martin *v.* Mackonochie, ii. 373, 374
Martyn, Henry, ii. 297
Martyrs' Memorial at Oxford, ii. 330
Mary I., Queen, i. 406, 411-429; ii. 198
Mary II., Queen, ii. 184, 186, 190, 239
Mary Queen of Scots, i. 454, 456
Maserfield, Battle of, i. 44
Maurice, Bishop of London, i. 170
Maurice, F. D., ii. 382-390
May, William, Dean of S. Paul's, i. 445, 448
Medeshampstede (Peterborough), Abbey of, i. 55, 137
Mediævalism, Extinction of, i. 350
'Meditations,' etc., Hervey's, ii. 264
Melancthon, i. 403
Mellitus, Bishop of London, i. 24, 25, 29, 31-34
Melmoth, William, ii. 192
Melrose, Abbey of, i. 90
'Memorial of the Church of England' (Drake), ii. 199-201
Mendicant Orders, i. 235-241, 271, 282, 351

Mercia, The Church in, i. 54, 55, 110-114
Merit *de congruo*, Doctrine of, i. 267
Merton, Council of, i. 299
Methodism, ii. 233, 259, 260 and *passim*
Metropolitan sees, Relationships between, i. 163, 183, 190, 191, 206, 207
Metropolitan Visitation (Laud's), ii. 73
Middle-class education and the Church, ii. 407, 408
Middleton, T. F., Bishop of Calcutta, ii. 294, 298
Millenary Petition, ii. 3, 4
Milles, Isaac, ii. 209
'Million Grant' for church-building, ii. 299
Milman, H. H., Dean of S. Paul's, ii. 313
Milner, Isaac, Dean of Carlisle, i. 267; ii. 269, 270, 277, 278
Milner, Joseph, ii. 268, 269
Milton, John, ii. 93
Minorites, i. 239. See 'Franciscans'
Missionary Bishops, ii. 409, 410
Mixed Councils, i. 76
'Moderate Episcopacy,' Ussher's scheme of, ii. 128
Monasteries. See under separate heads, 'Glastonbury,' 'Abingdon,' etc.
Monasteries, Reform of, i. 128, 165, 166
Monasteries, Increase of, i. 185, 194
Monasteries, Decay of, i. 319, 323, 344, 351
Monasteries, Schools of, i. 83 and *passim*
Monasteries, Dissolution of smaller, i. 377-380
Monasteries, Dissolution of larger, i. 383, 384
Monmouth, Duke of, ii. 154
Montague, Richard, Bishop of Chichester, ii. 43, 56-59
Montaigne, George, Archbishop of York, ii. 58
Moravians, Influence on John Wesley, ii. 235, 236
More, Hannah, ii. 281
More, Sir Thomas, i. 323, 330, 333-336, 338, 349, 376, 377
Morgan's 'Moral Philosopher' (Deist), ii. 222
Morley, George, Bishop of Winchester, ii. 148
Morton, Thomas, Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 323, 324, 333
Morton, Thomas, Bishop of Durham, ii. 43, 44, 46, 80, 123
'Muscular Christianity,' ii. 391
Music, Church, i. 83, 88, and *passim*
Mysticism, ii. 335, 390

N.

Nag's Head fable, i. 438
'Narrative of Events, etc.' (Palmer's), ii. 340
'National Apostasy' (Keble's Assize sermon), ii. 316, 317
National Society, The, ii. 294, 295
National Synods, i. 76
Naves of cathedrals utilized for public worship. ii. 397, 398
'Necessary Doctrine; or, Erudition of a Christian Man' (1543), i. 391
Neile, Richard, Archbishop of York, ii. 48, 95
Nelson, Robert, ii. 176, 177, 192, 207, 208, 239
Nennius, i. 10
Nevile, Thomas, Dean of Canterbury, ii. 2, 3
New College, Oxford, Foundation of, i. 291, 292
New Learning, The, i. 327, 341, 346. See also 'Renaissance.'
Newman, J. H., Cardinal, ii. 318, 319, 321-327, 331-333, 335-338, 342-344, 346
Newton, John, ii. 266, 267, 273
Newton, Thomas, Bishop of Bristol, ii. 402
Nice, Council of, i. 8
Nidd, Council of the, i. 87
Ninian, Saint, i. 12
'Nobody's Friends,' Club of, ii. 291
'No. 80' Tract, ii. 333
'No. 89' Tract, ii. 335, 345
'No. 90' Tract, ii. 335-338
Nonconformists, The first (1566), i. 466; ii. 20
Nonjurors, The earlier, ii. 40, 174-177, 194, 207, 208, 213
Nonjurors, The later, ii. 238, 240
Non-residence of clergy, ii. 403, 404
Norman Conquest, Effects of, on Church, i. 156-160, 169, 211
Norris, Henry Handley, ii. 292, 296
Northampton, Councils of, i. 207
Northumbria, The Church in, i. 34-46, 59-65, 67-70, 73
Nowell, Alexander, Dean of S. Paul's, i. 448, 463

O.

Oakeley, F., ii. 344
Oates, Titus, ii. 154
Oath, *Et cetera*, ii. 78, 79, 85
Oath *ex officio*, ii. 9, 94
Oath of allegiance to William and Mary, ii. 239
Oath of Succession (Henry VIII.), i. 376, 377
Occam, William, i. 234
Occasional conformity, ii. 136
Occasional conformity, Bills against, ii. 196, 198, 200, 205, 206
Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 128, 129
Offa, King of Mercia, i. 110, 112-114
Official Year-Book of Church of England, ii. 419
Oglethorpe, J. E., General, ii. 234
Oglethorpe, Owen, Bishop of Carlisle, i. 440
Oldcastle, Sir John, i. 302, 303-305
Oldham, Hugh, Bishop of Exeter, i. 344
Oley, Barnabas, ii. 112, 148
Ordeal, Trial by, i. 150
Ordinations during the Rebellion, ii. 123
Organs in churches, Objections to, i. 463
Oriel College. See 'Oxford Movement,' 'Newman,' 'Whately,' etc.
Oriel College Noetics, ii. 310-313
Ormund, Saint, Bishop of Salisbury, i. 218
Ornaments Rubric, ii. 375, 376
Oswald, Saint, King of Northumbria, i. 41-45, 49, 119
Oswald, Bishop of Worcester, i. 138
Oswin, King of Deira, i. 45
Oswy, King of Northumbria, i. 45, 47, 53-56, 59-63, 70
Otho, Cardinal, i. 230. See 'Constitutions'
Ottoboni, Cardinal, i. 235. See 'Constitutions'
Overall, John, Bishop of Norwich, ii. 21, 37, 44, 46
Overall's 'Convocation Book,' ii. 38-40
Oxford, Friars at, i. 236-241
Oxford, New Learning at, i. 327-338
Oxford, Conference between men of Old and New Learning, i. 416, 417
Oxford, Laud's services to, ii. 73
Oxford and Tract 90, ii. 337, 338, 341
Oxford and Ward's 'Ideal,' ii. 340-342
'Oxford Methodists,' The, ii. 233, 234
'Oxford Movement,' The, ii. 315

P

Padarn, Saint, i. 14
Paley, William, ii. 285
Pallium, The, i. 24, 25 *n.*, 177, 178
Palmer, Sir William, ii. 318-320, 330, 337
Pan-Anglican Conference (1867), ii. 410; (1878), ii. 411
Pandulf, Papal Legate, i. 223, 241
Panzani, Papal Legate, ii. 75
Papal Legates, i. 160, 161, 167, 191, 192, 196, 219, 223, 229, 342, 416
Papal schism, i. 279
Paraphrases of Erasmus, i. 406
Parker, Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 140, 435-439, 445, 448, 450, 460, 464, 469-471
Parker, Samuel, Bishop of Oxford, ii. 160
Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, i. 471
Parliament, Clergy summoned to, i. 255
Parliament and Convocation in spring of 1640, ii. 77, 84
Parochial libraries, Dr. Bray's, ii. 191, 193, 209, 210
'Parochial Sermons,' Newman's, ii. 328, 329
Parochial system, Rise of, i. 82, 83
Parsons, Robert, Jesuit, i. 456
Pastoral Aid Society, ii. 404
'Pastorale,' Gregory the Great's, i. 122, 123
Patrick, Saint, i. 12
Patrick, Simon, Bishop of Ely, ii. 123, 148, 149, 174, 192, 208
Paul's, S., Cross, Sermons at, i. 481
Paul's, S., Walk, ii. 68
Paul's, S., Cathedral, i. 29, 170; ii. 68
Paul's, S., Cathedral, Rebuilding of, ii. 155, 205
Paul's, S., School, Foundation of, i. 332, 335
Paul IV., Pope, i. 444
Paulinus, Archbishop (Bishop?) of York, i. 34, 36-40, 47
Peada, King of Mid-Anglia, i. 54, 55
Pearce, Zachary, Bishop of Rochester, ii. 248

Pearson, John, Bishop of Chester, ii. 121, 148, 151
Peasants' revolt, i. 283, 293
Pecock, Reginald, Bishop of Chichester, i. 308-313
Peel districts (1843), ii. 404
Pelagianism, in Britain, i. 9, 10
Penda, King of Mercia, i. 40, 41, 50, 53, 54
'Penitential,' Theodore's, i. 84
Percival, A. P., ii. 318, 320, 337
Perry, Archdeacon, i. 59 *n.*, 71, 116, 117
Peter Martyr, i. 402, 447, 462
Peter des Roches, Bishop of Winchester, i. 241
'Peter's Pence,' i. 114, 167, 266, 376
Petition to Charles I. (1641), ii. 99
Petitions against the Church (1640), ii. 90
Philip of Spain, i. 417, 456
'Philelentherus Lipsiensis' (Bentley) ii. 220
Phillpotts, Henry, Bishop of Exeter, ii. 352, 357, 358, 415
Philpot, Archdeacon, i. 413, 422
'Pietas Londinensis' (Paterson's), ii. 208
Phillimore, Sir R., ii. 374, 375
Pilgrimages, i. 172, 260
Pilgrimage of Grace, i. 382, 383, 412
Pisa, Council of, i. 306, 321
Pius IV., Pope, i. 447
Pius IX., Pope, ii. 354
Plague of London (1665), ii. 149, 150
Plegmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 122, 123, 126
Plundered ministers, Committee for, ii. 105
Pluralities, i. 322
Pluralities Act (1838), ii. 394, 403
Poetry Professorship at Oxford (1841), ii. 338
Pole, Reginald, Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 383, 389, 397, 398, 416-418, 428
Popular Tales (High Church), ii. 347
'Poor Priests,' Wiclif's, i. 284, 297
Poor, Richard, Bishop of Salisbury (afterwards Durham), i. 245
Porteus, Beilby, Bishop of London, ii. 280
Potter, Barnabas, Bishop of Carlisle, ii. 96
Potter, John, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 232, 237, 245
Poverty of clergy in Elizabeth's reign, i. 449, 450
'Practical View,' etc., Wilberforce's, ii. 272, 273
'Practice of Prelates' (1584), i. 476
Præmonstratensian Order, i. 189
*Præmunientes* clause, i. 255
Prayer-Book of 1549, i, 397, 399, 400, 445; ii. 375
Prayer-Book of 1552, i. 405, 446
Prayer-Book, Elizabethan, i. 436, 445, 446
Prayer-Book at Savoy Conference, ii. 134
Prayer-Book, 'Assent and consent to,' required, ii. 140
Prayer-Book, Commission for revising (1689), ii. 181
Presbyterians, ii. 99, 110, 113, 115, 127-131, 143
Preston, John, Master of Emmanuel College, ii. 43
Prideaux, John, Bishop of Worcester, ii. 96
Prideaux, Humphrey, Dean of Norwich, ii. 207
Printing, Effects of invention of, i. 326
Private chaplains, ii. 66
Privy Council (Edward VI.), i. 398
Prophesyings (1571), i. 470-472
'Prophetical Office of the Church (Newman), ii. 329
Provincial Synods, i. 76, 253-256; ii. 414. See also 'Convocations'
'Provisions' and 'Reservations,' Papal, i. 262
Prynne, William, ii. 74, 86, 100, 136
Psalmody, ii. 396
Public Worship Regulation Act (1874), ii. 377-380
Purchas Judgment (1871), ii. 374-377
Puritanism in time of Elizabeth, i. 429, 451, 461-482
Puritanism in Stuart Period. See the chapters on that period *passim*
Pusey, E. B., ii. 318, 326, 327, 339, 350, 418
'Puseyite' Controversy, The, ii. 350, 351

Q.

Quakers' Affirmation Bill (1722), ii. 250
Quakers' Relief Bill (1736), ii. 250
Queen Anne's Bounty, ii. 197, 198
Queens' College, Cambridge, Foundation of, i. 315
Queens' College, Cambridge, an

Evangelical centre, ii. 269, 277, 278
'Querela Cantabrigiensis' (Barwick), ii. 113

R.

Raikes, Robert (Sunday-schools), ii. 284, 285
Ralph, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 190, 191
Raynolds, John, Dean of Lincoln, ii. 6-9
Recusancy, i. 458; ii. 17, 18
Redwald, King of East Anglia, i. 35, 36, 51
*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, i. 396, 397
Reformation of Manners, Societies for the, ii. 189, 190
Reformation Parliament, The, i. 353-360, 367
Reform Bill of 1831-32, ii. 308, 309
Regius Professorships first founded, i. 392
*Regnans in Cœlis*, Bull (1570), i. 454
Religion, Committees of (1641), ii. 92
Religious Societies, The, ii. 155, 156, 189, 212
'Remains,' Froude's, ii. 327, 328
Remigius, Bishop of Lincoln, i. 169
Remonstrance of the Commons (1628), ii. 64; (1641) ii. 98, 111
Renaissance, The, i. 325-351
Repyngdon, Bishop of Lincoln, i. 286
Reserve in communicating religious knowledge, I. Williams on, ii. 333
Restraint of Appeals, i. 373, 376
Revival of Learning. See 'Renaissance'
Reynolds, Edward, Bishop of Norwich, ii. 130
Richard, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 218
Richard I., King, i. 221, 222
Richard II., King, i. 285, 296
Richard, Saint, Bishop of Chichester, i. 233, 248
Richard de Bury, Bishop of Durham, i. 259
Ribalds, The, i. 414
Ridley, Matthew, Bishop of London, i. 403, 406, 409, 413, 416, 425-428
Ridsdale case (ritual), ii. 380, 381
Ring in marriage, Objections to, ii. 3
Riots at S. George's-in-the-East, ii. 360-362
Ripon, Abbey of, 68, 69, 91
Risings against the Reformation in Edward VI.'s reign, i. 408, 409, 412
Ritual, Archbishop Laud's, ii. 68 *et seq.*
Ritual, Bishop Andrewes', ii. 42, 43
Ritual, Bishop Cosin's, ii. 86, 87
Ritual, Convocation on (1866), ii. 373
Ritual and the Oxford Movement, ii. 356
Ritual, Royal Commission on (1867), ii. 373
Ritual. See also the various ritual cases, Public Worship Act, Archbishop Tait, etc.
Robert, Duke of Normandy, i. 176, 221
Robert of Jumièges, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 145-147
Robertson, F. W., ii. 393
Rochester, Bishopric of, i. 29, 30, 47
Rockingham, Council of, i. 177
Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, i. 194
Rogers, John, protomartyr, i. 419
Romaine, William, ii. 260, 265
Roman Catholic Relief Bills, ii. 304, 305
Roman Controversy, The, in Elizabeth's reign, i. 452-461
Roman Controversy in James II.'s reign, ii. 160, 161
Roman hierarchy in England, ii. 354
Romanizers in Tract Movement, ii. 340, 350
Rome, England's relation to, i. 70, 80-83, 87, 124, 146, 147, 159, 163-167, 175, 178-182, 193, 226; ii. 343
Root and Branch Bill (1641), ii. 90, 91; (1645), ii. 102
Rose, H. J., ii. 293, 317, 318, 320
Rotheram, Thomas, Archbishop of York, i. 318, 319
Royal Society, Attitude of the Church to, ii. 151
Royal Supremacy, The, i. 167, 367, 368, 407, 443, 452
Rubrics, Non-observance of, ii. 356-358
Rufinianus, i. 24
Rugby men, The, ii. 393
Ryder, Henry, Bishop of Lichfield, ii. 280, 310
Rye House Plot, ii. 154

S.

Sabbath Controversy, The, ii. 27-30
Sabert, King of the East Saxons, i. 30, 32

Sacheverell, Henry, The case of, ii. 202-204, 214
S. Alban's, Abbey of, i. 113, 134
S. Bartholomew's Hospital, Foundation of, i. 410
S. John's College, Cambridge, Foundation of, i. 348
S. John's College, Cambridge, Puritans at, i. 467
S. Thomas's Hospital, Foundation of, i. 409
Salisbury, Bishopric of, i. 165
Sampson, Dean of Christ Church, i. 466
Sancroft, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 156, 162, 173, 174
Sanderson, Robert, Bishop of Lincoln, ii. 80, 116, 120, 121, 147
Sandys, Edwin, Bishop of London, afterwards Archbishop of York, i. 449, 463, 470, 479
Sardica, Council of, i. 8
Sarum, Use of, i. 218
Savoy Conference, The, i. 131-136
Sawtrey, William, Lollard, i. 300
Scandalous Ministers, Committee for, ii. 105
Schism, Act of (1714), ii. 206
Scholastic Philosophy, The, i. 238, 281, 295
Scory, John, Bishop of Hereford, i. 438, 442
Scotch aid to Long Parliament, ii. 102-104
Scott, Thomas ('Commentary'), ii. 267, 268, 282
Secessions to Rome in 1845, ii. 340, 341; after Gorham case, ii. 353
Secker, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 253-255, 283, 290
Seculars and regulars, i. 128, 166, 270, 319, 323, 378, 452
Sees transferred from villages to large centres, i. 164, 165
Sellynge, William, i. 328
Selsey, Bishopric of, i. 165
Seminary priests in England, i. 455, 456; ii. 16
'Serious Call,' Law's, ii. 230, 231, 264, 273
Seven Bishops, Trial of the, ii. 164, 165
Severus, Bishop of Treves, i. 11
Sewall de Bovill, Archbishop of York, i. 233
Shaftesbury, Earl of, and ritual, ii. 378
Shaftesbury, Monastery of, i. 122
Shaftesbury's, Earl of, 'Characteristics,' ii. 220, 221
Sharp, John, Archbishop of York, ii. 148, 161, 177, 178, 190, 195, 196, 204, 212
Sheldon, Gilbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 132, 137, 145, 146, 149, 152, 156
Sherlock, Richard, of Winwick, ii. 148
Sherlock, Thomas, Bishop of London, ii. 221, 245
Sherlock, William, Dean of S. Paul's, ii. 40, 162, 266
Sibthorpe, ii. 59
Sigebert, King of East Angles, i. 51-53, 151
Sigebert, King of East Saxons, i. 56
Sikes, Thomas, of Guilsborough, ii. 293, 350, 351
Simeon, Charles, ii. 276, 277, 282, 297
Simon de Montfort, i. 234, 235, 240
Siric, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 138, 139
Sisterhoods in Victorian era, ii. 418
Six Articles, Law of the (1539), i. 390, 395
'Six Points' (of ritual), ii. 373
Skinner, Robert, Bishop of Oxford, ii. 96, 122, 123
Slave trade, i. 171; ii. 282
Smectymnian Controversy, ii. 93
Smith, Myles, Bishop of Gloucester, ii. 14, 49
Smith, Sir Thomas, chairman of Ecclesiastical Commission, i. 445
Smythies, Richard, ii. 156
Snape, Andrew, Provost of Eton, ii. 228
Society for Promotion of Christian Knowledge, ii. 191, 192, 408
Society for Propagation of the Gospel, ii. 192, 193, 212, 234, 296, 298, 408
Societies, Wesley's, ii. 236. See also 'Religious Societies,' 'Reformation of Manners,' etc.
Solemn League and Covenant, ii. 103, 104, 116, 129, 139
Somerset, Protector, i. 394, 400, 401
South, Robert, ii. 144, 148, 151, 208, 226
Southwark commission against heretics (Mary I.), i. 419-423
Spanish Armada, i. 458
Spanish match (Philip and Mary), i. 417
Spencer, Henry, Bishop of Norwich, i. 292-294
Spinckes, Nathaniel, ii. 176, 207

Square cap, Objections to, i. 463
Stanley, A. P., Dean of Westminster, ii. 393
Star Chamber, The, i. 472; ii. 69, 72, 74, 94
Statute of Carlisle, i. 257
Statutes of Mortmain, i. 256, 257
Statutes of Præmunire, i. 264-266, 296, 308, 361, 455
Statutes of Provisors, i. 262-265, 272, 296, 308
Stephen, James, ii. 275, 282
Stephen, King, i. 194-198
Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 147, 158, 160, 161
Stillingfleet, Edward, Bishop of Worcester, ii. 121, 162, 174, 178, 185, 190, 194
Stokesley, John, Bishop of London, i. 363
Stubbs, William, Bishop of Oxford, i. 116, 244, 252, 255
Subdivision of dioceses, i. 79-82, 127, 183; ii. 400
Submission of the clergy (Henry VIII.), i. 370, 371, 376
Succession Act (Henry VIII.), i. 376, 378
Sudbury, Simon, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 265, 274, 284
Suffragan Bishops, ii. 401
Sunday recreations, ii. 27-29, 72
Sunday-schools, Rise of, ii. 284, 285
Superstitions in Early English Church, i. 154
Supremacy, Act of (Elizabeth), i. 452, 453
'Supreme Governor of the Church,' i. 440
'Supreme Head of the Church,' i. 368, 369, 378, 393, 440, 441
Surplice, Objections to (Elizabeth), i. 463 *et seq.*
Surplice Riots (Victoria), ii. 358
Sussex, Conversion of, i. 85, 86
Swithin, Saint, Bishop of Winchester, i. 117
Synods, i. 76, 77, 164, 253, 254. See under 'Diocesan,' 'National,' and 'Provincial' Synods, and 'Convocations'

T.

Tait, A. C., Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 360, 373, 374, 376-378, 381, 405, 411
Taxation of clergy, i. 254-256; ii. 137
Taylor, Jeremy, Bishop of Down and Connor, ii. 120-122
Taylor, Rowland, of Hadleigh, i. 403, 420
Teignmouth, John, Lord, ii. 275, 297
'Ten Articles' (1536), i. 389, 390
Tenison, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 123, 162, 185, 186, 188, 190, 193
Test Act (1673), ii. 153, 159
Test Act, Repeal of (1828), ii. 306
Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 195-199, 217, 218
Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 71-80, 93, 106, 107, 118, 152
Theological colleges, ii. 402
'Theron and Aspasio' (Hervey's), ii. 264
Thetford, Bishopric of, i. 165
Thirlwall, Connop, Bishop of S. David's, ii. 314, 393
'Thirty-two, Committee of' (Henry VIII.), i.
'Thirty-two, Committee of' (Edward VI.), i. 396
Thomas of Bayeux, Archbishop of York, i. 163, 169, 172
Thomas, William, Bishop of Worcester, ii. 174
Thoresby, Ralph (Diary), ii. 209
Thorndike, Herbert, ii. 112, 148
Thornton, John, ii. 273, 274
Thornton, Henry, ii. 274, 282
'Three Denominations,' The, ii. 118
Thurkitul, Chancellor, i. 138
Thurstan, Archbishop of York, i. 187
Tillotson, John, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 149, 162, 172-174, 178, 181, 184. 185, 189, 190
Tindal, Matthew ('Christianity as Old as the Creation'), ii. 221
Tithe Commutation Act (1836), ii. 394
Tithe system, i. 114-117
Toland, John ('Christianity not Mysterious'), ii. 188, 220
Toleration, Act of (1689), ii. 178, 179, 196
Toleration, Growth of, ii. 248
Toleration imperfectly understood, i. 451, 467; ii. 98
Toleration, Presbyterians against, ii. 117, 127
Tonsure, The, i. 71, 72, 202
'Tortura Torti' (Andrewes), ii. 26
'Tracts for the Times,' ii. 322-325
Translation of Bishops, ii. 402, 403
Transubstantiation, Doctrine of, i. 162, 267, 280, 281, 304
Travers, Walter, i. 478, 479

'Treatise on the Church of Christ' (Palmer), ii. 330
Trelawney, Sir John, Bishop of Bristol, ii. 162
Trent, Council of, i. 447, 455
Trevecca, Lady Huntingdon's college at, ii. 260-262
Trinity College, Cambridge, Foundation of, i. 384, 392
Trinity College, Cambridge, Puritans at, i. 467
'Triers,' Cromwell's, ii. 118
Trinitarian Controversy, ii. 187, 225-227
Tuda, Bishop of Lindisfarne, i. 68
Tunstall, Cuthbert, Bishop of Durham, i. 363, 369, 405, 412
Turner, Francis, Bishop of Ely, ii. 161, 174
Twiford, Council of, i. 79, 92
Tyndale, William, translator of Bible, i. 387

U.

Uniformity, Act of (Charles II.), ii. 140-142
Uniformity, Act of (Elizabeth), i. 453
United action of Church, ii. 412-417
Universities, Attempt of James II. to Romanize, ii. 160 *et seq.*
Universities, Henry VIII.'s care for, i. 392
Universities' mission to Central Africa, ii. 409
Universities on Henry VIII.'s divorce, i. 359, 364, 365
Universities' power to license preachers, i. 466
Universities 'purged' by Puritans, ii. 111-113
Ussher, James, Archbishop of Dublin, ii. 92, 93, 96, 97, 111

V.

Venn, Henry, ii. 260, 266
Venn, John, ii. 275, 276
Venner's insurrection (1661), ii. 128, 131
Vergilius, Archbishop of Arles, i. 22
Vestiarian Controversy, i. 463-465
'Via Media' (Newman), ii. 329, 332, 333
Vicar-General (T. Cromwell), i. 378, 388
Visitation of monasteries, T. Cromwell's, i. 378-380
Visitation of the whole Church (Edward VI.), i. 398
Vitalian, Pope, i. 70-72
Voysey, C., Case of, ii. 370

W.

Wake, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii. 187, 243-245
Walkelin, Bishop of Winchester, i. 166, 169
Walker, Obadiah, Master of University College, ii. 160
Wall, William ('Infant Baptism'), ii. 207
Walpole, Sir Robert, ii. 214, 215, 244, 245
Waltham Abbey, i. 148
Walton, Brian, Bishop of Chester, ii. 148
Walton, Izaak, ii. 44, 147
Walter de Map, i. 212
Warburton, William, Bishop of Gloucester, ii. 224
Ward, Seth, Bishop of Salisbury, ii. 122, 148
Ward, W. G., ii. 340
Warham, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 331, 339, 340, 342, 363, 370
Wars of the Roses, i. 308, 316, 322, 354
Waterland, Daniel, ii. 227
Watson, John, Bishop of Lincoln, i. 443
Watson, Joshua, ii. 292, 296, 299, 319
Watson, Richard, Bishop of Llandaff, ii. 286, 402
Wearmouth, Abbey of, i. 94, 95, 118
Wedmore, Treaty of, i. 121
Welsh Church, The, i. 99, 124, 125, 127
Wesley, Charles, ii. 233, 236
Wesley, John, ii. 231-238, 261-265
Wesley, Samuel, the Elder, ii. 192, 208, 231, 232
Wesley, Samuel, the Younger, ii. 238
Wesley, Susanna, ii. 231, 232
Wessex, The Church in, i. 48-51, 114, 115, 127
Westminster Abbey, i. 149
Westminster Assembly of Divines, ii. 107-110
Westminster, Conference at, in 1559, i. 442
Westminster, Councils at, i. 202, 219
Westminster Spiritual Aid Fund, ii. 404
Whately, Richard, Archbishop of Dublin, ii. 311, 312
Whiston, William, ii. 226
Whitby (Streanæshalch), Council of, i. 59-63. 73, 76, 77, 91, 151

White Cross Society, ii. 419
White, Francis, Bishop of Ely, ii. 28, 50, 57
White, John, Bishop of Winchester, i. 443
White, Thomas, Bishop of Peterborough, ii. 162, 174
Whitefield, George, ii. 233, 236, 260, 261, 266
Whitgift, John, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 467, 472-475, 479, 481; ii. 4, 5, 9, 10
Whiting, Richard, last Abbot of Glastonbury, i. 384
'Whole Duty of Man,' The, ii. 266
Wiclif, John, i. 268-287, 302, 311
Wiclifites. See 'Lollards'
Wighard, i. 70
Wilberforce, Robert I., Archdeacon, ii. 353
Wilberforce, Samuel, Bishop of Winchester, ii. 376, 377, 400, 411, 412, 414, 416
Wilberforce, William, ii. 271-273, 282, 296
Wilfrid, Saint, Archbishop of York, i. 60-63, 68-70, 74-76, 79-82, 84-88, 94
Wilkins, John, Bishop of Chester, ii. 151
William, Bishop of London, i. 172
William II., King, i. 173-181
William III., King, ii. 161-194
William of Corbeil, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 191
William of Warelwast, Bishop of Exeter, i. 182
William of Waynflete, i. 292, 315-318
William of Wykeham, i. 287-292, 315
William the Conqueror, i. 156-160, 175, 205, 211, 252
Williams, Isaac, ii. 333-335, 338, 339
Williams, John, Lord Keeper, ii. 25, 49, 64, 71, 74, 84, 86, 92, 93, 95
Willis, Dr., Dean of Lincoln, ii. 193
Willis, Thomas, ii. 151
Wilson, Thomas, Bishop of Sodor and Man, ii. 245, 246
Winchelsey, Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 255, 260
Winchester, Bishopric of, i. 50
Winchester Cathedral, i. 290
Winchester, College of S. Mary at, i. 291, 292, 315
Winchester, Councils of, i. 115, 160, 178
Winchester 'High' School, i. 288
Windsor Commission for Book of Common Prayer, i. 399, 400
Winfrid, Bishop of Mercia, i. 77
Wini, Bishop of Winchester, i. 50, 69
Winniffe, Thomas, Bishop of Lincoln, ii. 95
Winwidfield, Battle of, i. 54
Witham, Abbey of, i. 188, 213
Wolsey, Thomas, Cardinal Archbishop of York, i. 340-343, 355, 356, 359-361, 366, 379
Woodard Schools, ii. 408
Worcester House Conference, ii. 130, 131
Wordsworth, Christopher, Bishop of Lincoln, ii. 399, 401, 415
Wordsworth, Christopher, Master of Trinity, Cambridge, ii. 293
Wotton, William, Dean of Canterbury, i. 437
Wren, Matthew, Bishop of Ely, ii. 80, 87, 151
Wren, Sir Christopher, ii. 151, 155
Wulfhere, King of Mercia, i. 67, 74
Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester, i. 169-172

Y.

Yates, Richard ('Church in Danger'), ii. 299
York, Baptism of King Edwin and consecration of Paulinus at, i. 38
York, Cloister school at, under Egbert and Albert, i. 107-109
York in British times, i. 7
York in later history. See under heads of different Archbishops
York, Intentions of Gregory the Great regarding, i. 25
York metropolis of Northern Church, i. 68
York, subdivision of diocese by Theodore, i. 79, 80
York, visitation of Theodore, and incumbency of Wilfrid, i. 73-75

THE END.

BILLING AND SONS, PRINTERS, GUILDFORD.

*3, Paternoster Buildings, E.C., and*

*44, Victoria Street, S.W.*

A SELECTION FROM

# WELLS GARDNER, DARTON, & CO.'S

## Catalogue of Books.

By the Rev. A. C. AINSLIE, M.A., LL.D., Vicar of Langport.

### INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUNIOR CLASSES IN SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards. **1s.** each.

A packet of Lesson Leaflets for a class of ten. Price **5s.**

Vol. I. THE STORY OF THE GOSPELS IN FIFTY-TWO LESSONS.
Vol. II. FIFTY-TWO LESSONS ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

*These books are specially designed to help those who have not been trained as Teachers.*

By the Most Rev. the ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

### PASTORAL LETTERS AND SYNODAL CHARGES.

Addressed to the Clergy and Laity in the Diocese of Lichfield.

By WILLIAM DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN, Archbishop of York.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **7s. 6d.**

By Lady BAKER.

### FRIENDLY WORDS FOR OUR GIRLS.

Large crown 8vo. Paper, **1s.**; cloth, **1s. 6d.** [*24th Thousand.*

By Lady BAKER—*continued.*

## HALF HOURS WITH MY GIRLS.

Being Twenty-six Readings for Sundays. First Series.

Small crown 8vo. Cloth. **2s. 6d.** [*4th Edition.*

## LETTERS TO MY GIRL FRIENDS.

Small crown 8vo. Cloth. **2s. 6d.**

## MORE HALF HOURS WITH MY GIRLS.

Or, Readings for a Village Class. Second Series.

Small crown 8vo. Cloth. **2s. 6d.**

By C. F. MOBERLY BELL, Author of "Egyptian Finance."

## FROM PHARAOH TO FELLAH.

With upwards of 130 Illustrations from Drawings by GEORGES MONTBARD. Engraved by CHARLES BARBANT.

Crown 8vo. Fancy cloth boards. **12s. 6d.**

With an Introduction by the late BISHOP OF CARLISLE.

## HOLINESS TO THE LORD.

The Character of the Christian Priest.

Adapted from the Freneh of the ABBÉ DUBOIS for the use of the English Clergy.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **7s. 6d.**

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF LICHFIELD.

## IN COVENANT WITH GOD.

A Book of Instruction on Confirmation.

By the Right Rev. the Hon. AUGUSTUS LEGGE, D.D.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards. **1s. 6d.**

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF MISSISSIPPI.

## THE WORLD AND THE KINGDOM.

By the Right Rev. HUGH MILLAR THOMPSON, D.D.

Crown 8vo. **3s. 6d.** [*5th Edition.*

By the Right Hon. the BISHOP OF RIPON.

## SHORT OUTLINE LESSONS FOR EACH SUNDAY IN THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.

By the Right Rev. W. BOYD CARPENTER, D.D.

16mo, **8d.**; cloth boards, **1s.**

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD.

## DAILY FAMILY PRAYER.

By the Right Rev. W. WALSHAM HOW, D.D.

Fcap. 8vo, cloth boards, **1s. 6d.**; calf or morocco, **7s. 6d.**
[*17th Edition.*

☞ A Sixpenny Edition, in large type, cloth boards, is now ready. This volume will be found most suitable for Parochial distribution, and is the cheapest Book of Family Prayers yet published.

## NOTES ON THE CHURCH SERVICE.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth. **9d.**

## PASTORAL WORK.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards. **2s. 6d.** [*4th Edition.*

## PASTOR IN PAROCHIÂ.

With the Appendix.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards, red edges, **3s. 6d.**; leather limp, **5s.**; calf limp antique, **10s. 6d.** Also morocco plain, and best flexible morocco, red under gilt edges, **12s. 6d.** [*23rd Edition.*

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD—*continued.*

## PLAIN WORDS. First Series.

Sixty Short Sermons for the Poor, and for Family Reading.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, turned in, **2s.**; cloth, bevelled boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** Large-type Edition, cloth boards, **3s. 6d.** [56*th Edition.*

## PLAIN WORDS. Second Series.

Short Sermons for the Sundays and Chief Holy-days of the Christian Year.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, turned in, **2s.**; cloth, bevelled boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** Large-type Edition, cloth boards, **3s. 6d.** [34*th Edition.*

Vols. I. and II. in one vol. Cloth boards. **4s. 6d.**

## PLAIN WORDS. Third Series.

Forty Meditations with a View to the Deepening of the Spiritual Life.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, **2s.**; cloth, bevelled boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** Large-type Edition, cloth boards, **3s. 6d.** [23*rd Edition.*

## PLAIN WORDS. Fourth Series.

Forty Readings for those who Desire to Pray Better.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, turned in, **2s.**; cloth, bevelled boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** [10*th Edition.*

Vols. III. and IV. in one. Cloth boards. **4s. 6d.**

## PLAIN WORDS TO CHILDREN.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, turned in, **2s.** Crown 8vo, cloth, bevelled boards, **2s. 6d.** [5*th Edition.*

## POEMS.

Complete Edition. Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards, gilt edges, **3s. 6d.** Without the Hymns, **3s.** Tree calf, or calf half extra, **7s. 6d.** [4*th Edition.*

By the Right Rev. the BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD—*continued.*

## SEVEN LENTEN SERMONS ON PSALM LI.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, turned in. **1s.** [*14th Edition.*

## TWENTY-FOUR PRACTICAL SERMONS.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, turned in, **2s.**; cloth boards, red edges, **2s. 6d.** [*14th Edition.*

## WORDS OF GOOD CHEER.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp, **1s. 6d.** Small crown 8vo, cloth, bevelled boards, **2s. 6d.**

By the Rev. JOHN C. BLISSARD, M.A.

## SIDELIGHTS ON REVELATION.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **2s. 6d.**

By the late Rev. H. W. BURROWS, B.D., Canon of Rochester.

## THE EVE OF ORDINATION.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth limp. **1s. 6d.** [*4th Edition.*

Containing:—Two Meditations before Holy Communion—The Young Clergyman's Dangers and Safeguards—Visiting the Sick—A few Words on Writing Sermons—An Address on the Day of Ordination.

By the Rev. F. C. WOODHOUSE, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Folkestone.

*Uniform with "A Manual for Lent," &c.*

## A MANUAL OF READINGS FOR SPECIAL OCCASIONS.

Thoughts for the Times.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **3s. 6d.**

The New Work by the Rev. H. BICKERSTETH OTTLEY, M.A., Vicar of Eastbourne.

## CHRIST AND THE WORLD.

Aspects of Faith and Duty.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. [*In the Press.*

By the **Countess COWPER.**

## HELP AT HAND;

Or, What shall we do in Accidents or Illness?

Numerous Illustrations.

Fcap. 8vo, paper cover, **3d.**; cloth, **6d.** [4th *Edition.*

By the **Rev. EVAN DANIEL, M.A.**

## THE DAILY OFFICES AND LITANY.

Being an Introduction to the Study of the Prayer-Book. Specially designed for the Use of National Schools and Sunday Schools.

Fcap. 8vo, **8d.**; cloth boards, **10d.** [12*th Thousand.*

## THE PRAYER-BOOK.

Its History, Language, and Contents.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.** [16*th Edition.*

---

## DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH, ANCIENT AND MODERN.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **7s. 6d.**

Edited by the **Rev. P. H. DITCHFIELD, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.**

## THE NATIONAL CHURCHES.

**I. GERMANY.** By the Rev. S. BARING-GOULD, M.A., author of "Mehalah," "Germany Past and Present," &c. With Maps. Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.**

**II. SPAIN.** By the Rev. FREDERICK MEYRICK, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln. Editor of "The Foreign Church Chronicle." With Map. Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.**

**III. IRELAND.** By the Rev. THOMAS OLDEN, M.A. With Maps. Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.**

Arrangements have been made for volumes by the BISHOP OF DELAWARE, CANON LUCKOCK, CANON MACLEAR, and others.

By the **Rev. HENRY T. ELLISON, M.A.**

## Holy Matrimony.

The Married Life of the Christian Man and Woman.

Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards. **1s. 6d.** [*New Edition.*

By the late **Rev. THOMAS FARRAR**, Archdeacon of Guiana.

## The Christian Ministry.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.** This volume has been largely used in the Colonies as a Manual for Candidates for Ordination. The present issue has been carefully revised.

[*4th Edition—Revised and Enlarged.*

## The Family Lesson-Book.

Being a Selection of Morning and Evening Readings for the Christian Year. Based upon the Church's Lectionary.

Crown 8vo, cloth boards, with silk registers, **1s. 6d.**; leather, **3s. 6d.**

Each Reading is complete in itself, and affords a simple subject for meditation. Every Holy-Day will be found to be conveniently noted, and the Readings to correspond with its proper teaching. The cheapest book of the kind ever published.

By **Mrs. E. M. FIELD.**

## The Child and His Book.

Some Account of the History and Progress of Children's Literature in England.

Illustrated.

Large crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.** [*2nd Edition*

By Mrs. E. M. FIELD—*continued.*

## ETHNE.

Being a truthful History of the great and final Settlement of Ireland by Oliver Cromwell, and certain other noteworthy Events from the Journals of Ethne O'Connor, and of Roger Standfast, Captain in the Army of the Commons of England.

With Etched Title and Frontispiece. Large crown 8vo. Appropriate cloth boards. **6s.** [*3rd Edition.*

By the Rev. JOSEPH HAMMOND, LL.B., B.A.

## CHURCH OR CHAPEL?

An Eirenicon.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **5s.**

[*3rd Edition, with Additions and Appendix.*

By the Hon. Mrs. C. HOBART, *née* N. P. W.

## THE CHANGED CROSS.

With Outline Illustrations by H. J. A. MILES.

Square 16mo. Cloth, bevelled boards, gilt edges. **1s. 6d.**

[*33rd Edition.*

By the Rev. EDWIN HOBSON, M.A.

## AIDS TO THE STUDY OF THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

Fcap. 8vo, cloth boards, 2 vols. **1s. 6d.** each; or 1 vol. complete, with Map, **2s. 6d.**

The New Work by the Right Hon. the EARL and COUNTESS OF MEATH.

## SOCIAL AIMS.

Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. **6s.**

LONDON: WELLS GARDNER, DARTON, & CO.

3, PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS, E.C.,

AND 44, VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.